PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

ONE of the happy trends in modern publishing is the speed with which significant theological books from the Continent are being made available in English translations. A generation ago such a translation was an unusual event. Now it is almost a normal service. In consequence the outstanding theologians of the Continent are almost as well known here as in their own lands. Among contemporary New Testament scholars, for instance, the names of Bultmann, Cullmann and Jeremias are nearly as familiar to British students as those of Dodd, T. W. Manson and V. Taylor.

Professor Oscar CULLMANN, Professor of the Theological Faculty of the University of Basel, and also Professor at the Sorbonne in Paris, who has for many years wielded great influence in the sphere of New Testament studies, has recently written a small book on the life after death, and this has just been published in English,[1] Its title is *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?* A sub-title indicates that this is not a speculative treatise, but a careful assessment of 'The Witness of the New Testament' upon this subject. It was first published in French in Switzerland as part of a symposium in honour of Karl Barth's seventieth birthday in 1956.

The Preface to the book gives some indication of the sharp and even angry response of many readers to the provocative statements it contains. The author received many indignant letters with strong protests, bearing evidence of the 'astonishment, sorrow and deep distress' which the article had caused even among those who had welcomed his earlier writings. The violence of the criticism makes us approach the book not only with interest, but with a measure of curiosity.

In reply to his critics CULLMANN affirms that it is not his own ideas which he has been presenting, but those of the New Testament; therefore any rebuke administered to him must be based on a different exegesis of the relevant passages in the New Testament and not on merely personal opinions; moreover those who dissent strongly from what the New Testament teaches are not compelled to accept it as true. But we must begin by recognizing what it is that the New Testament has to say. CULLMANN's main thesis is that the thinking of most modern Christians about the afterlife is shaped rather by the philosophical speculation of Greek thinkers than by the affirmations of the New Testament. '1 Corinthians 15 has been sacrificed for the *Phaedo*.'

In the brief Introduction the author insists on the need for recognizing the great difference between Plato and the New Testament on this issue. The New Testament, he reiterates, knows nothing of the immortality of the soul. 'For the first Christians the soul is not intrinsically immortal, but rather became so only through the resurrection of Jesus Christ and through faith in Him.' This has, of course, been said before; but more disconcerting blows begin to fall in the chapter which follows, whose subject is 'The Last Enemy: Death.'

In this chapter CULLMANN develops a most poignant contrast between the manner in which Socrates faced death as described in Plato's *Phaedo*, and the attitude to His approaching death which the evangelists ascribe to Jesus. For Plato and Socrates the body is a regrettable hindrance to the soul, and so death is the soul's liberator. 'Death is the soul's great friend' and therefore 'Socrates goes to his death in complete peace and composure.' In contrast the distress of Jesus as death draws near is made vividly, almost painfully, plain. He shrinks from it with horror and dread. Bluntly CULLMANN tells us: 'He is afraid of death.' 'He was really afraid.' 'There is Socrates, calmly and composedly speaking of the immortality of the soul; here Jesus, weeping and crying.'

CULLMANN draws this almost brutal contrast in order to bring out more clearly the wonder of the Resurrection and its victory over the tyrant death. But so harshly is the contrast drawn that some readers must wonder whether the faith which produced Socrates' calm is not to be preferred to that which left Jesus so harassed and distraught. Surely CULLMANN is not fair in drawing this sharp antithesis as though the two cases are in every way parallel. There is the widest possible difference between death by drinking the merciful hemlock,

[1] Epworth Press; 6s. net.

and death by crucifixion, the most merciless and prolonged torture that man had devised for the most hated criminal. Moreover Socrates was an old man, and Jesus still very young. In addition we surely recognize that for Jesus the burden of death consisted in far more than just the end of His own individual life. We regret that CULLMANN, in seeking to achieve greater effectiveness for the point he wishes to make, has here presented his case with something less than complete fairness.

Not only by Jesus, but through the New Testament, death is viewed not as something natural, as the Greeks viewed it, but 'rather as something unnatural, abnormal, opposed to God.' It is the 'wages of sin.' It is not a friend to be welcomed, but an enemy to be crushed and overcome, and it is the Resurrection which overcomes this alien power. In the resurrection of Christ a new factor is brought into the world. By it a new life in Christ is made possible to the believer, and this new life, inaugurated here on earth, is marked by the presence of the Holy Spirit, and is to be regarded as an anticipation or foretaste of the Resurrection which lies beyond bodily death.

The most controversial chapter is the fourth, whose subject is 'Those who Sleep.' In ch. 3 CULLMANN has discussed the meaning of the resurrection of the body, and has distinguished it clearly from what he regards as the very misleading statement in the creed about the 'resurrection of the flesh.' He now asks: 'When does this transformation of the body take place?' 'The whole New Testament,' he affirms, 'answers: At the End, and this is to be understood literally, that is in the temporal sense.'

If the resurrection of the body is not till 'the Last Day,' this raises the vexed question of the 'interim condition' of the dead. 'Death is conquered, but it will not be abolished until the End.' The transformation of the body, he argues, does not occur immediately after each individual death, although Karl Barth has placed this interpretation upon the New Testament evidence. The condition of the believing dead is one of 'sleep' until the Last Day. This understanding of the New Testament evidence has usually been limited to some of the smaller sects, who argue from the Scripture that a Christian is in a state of unconsciousness between his own death and the day of resurrection. To many this seems far removed from the Christian hope, but CULLMANN avoids some of the difficulty by applying to this interim condition some of the texts which have usually been used to describe the finality of heaven. 'Being with Christ in paradise' (Lk 23^{43}), 'departing to be with Christ' (Ph 1^{23}), 'being absent from the body and at home with the Lord' (2 Co 5^{8}) are taken to be descriptive of this interim period, though it seems odd to identify these ultimate privileges of the Christian with a condition of 'sleep.' For not only are they, during this 'sleep,' with Christ, but also they continue to possess the Holy Spirit.

That there are passages in the New Testament which seem to imply an interim period between death and the final resurrection, cannot be denied. But usually other texts, such as those just quoted, have been taken to offset them. Scholars have been content to say that on this subject a measure of inconsistency is to be recognized within the New Testament, sometimes a temporary mode of expressing the truth being superseded by something more enduring. CULLMANN, however, seems unable to accept this interpretation and feels himself compelled to compress all the evidence into a single consistent whole. By this necessity he is driven to apply to this 'dim unknown' of the interim-sleep passages radiant with immediate hope and pulsating with imminent triumph.

CULLMANN is not unaware of the unusual nature of his exposition, and rather surprisingly concedes that in fact his interpretation brings the hope of the New Testament somewhat nearer to the Greek hope of immortality, which earlier he has condemned as wholly un-Biblical. 'There is a sense in which a kind of approximation to the Greek teaching does actually take place, to the extent that the inner man, who has already been transformed by the Spirit (Ro $6^{3ff.}$), and consequently made alive, continues to live with Christ in this transformed state, in this condition of sleep.'

It seems, therefore, that the 'interim sleep' is in fact what most of us have meant by heaven, a fellowship with Christ more real than even the best we may know here on earth, though even here it is in a measure anticipated in the gift of the Holy Spirit. This, however, is not to be regarded as the final blessing. Somewhere beyond it lies an even greater privilege characterized as 'the resurrection of the body' on the Last Day.

Professor CULLMANN'S provocative exposition will awaken discussion among English-speaking Christians just as it has already done on the Continent, and it will send students back to study again the teaching of the New Testament on this subject.

Some books perform more and some books perform less than they promise in their title. It is rare to find a book which does both things at one and the

same time. Such a book is *Vocabulary of the Bible*, edited by Professor J.-J. Von Allmen, with an Introduction by Professor H. H. Rowley.[1] The book is an English translation of a well-known Continental work. In it thirty-six scholars have combined to present the vocabulary of the Bible under a series of articles on great words of the Bible.

This book performs far more than it claims in its title, because it has become in reality a monumental theology of the Bible. It performs less than it claims in its title, for its linguistic information, and, indeed, its linguistic interest, are very small. It belongs to the theologies of the Bible far more than to the dictionaries of the Bible, which statement is not intended as a criticism, but merely as a statement of the facts.

Let us test it by one of its outstanding articles, its article on the word *Law*. In Hebrew the word for law is *torah* which comes from the root *yarah*, which means to fling or throw. Its usage to mean the law may come from the teacher's gesture of the outstretched hand in teaching, or from a similar gesture of drawing lots to discover the will of God. The word *torah* occurs in the Old Testament more than two hundred and twenty times.

Originally it meant priestly or prophetic oral instruction; but quite naturally the term was applied to books containing such revelations from God, and especially to the Pentateuch. So important are these books that for the Jew the other books of the Old Testament are quite secondary. The *Talmud* can say: 'If Israel had not sinned, the five books of the *Torah* alone would have been given to him, together with that of Joshua' (*Nedarim*, 22b). Being the law of God, this law came to be regarded as the greatest of all blessings. Bit by bit it began to usurp the very place of God in Jewish piety; the worship of the law became almost an idolatry. Tradition became even more important than law, and religion was crushed under the burden of the law, and the joyful freedom of grace was lost.

This *Torah* acquired certain characteristics. It has the notion of *authority*. It comes from God and the covenant people must show their separateness from other people by faithful obedience to it. It contains *dogmatic* truth. It tells men, not only what God *says*, but what God *is* and *does*. That is why the Pentateuch has history as well as legislation. It has the notion of *completeness*. There is no distinction between a religious sphere and a secular sphere in life in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. All life is the sphere of God. There is the notion of *finality*. The law is not theoretical, it governs daily life and living, although it is noteworthy that it is predominantly negative. The Rabbis found in the Pentateuch three hundred and sixty-five prohibitions and two hundred and forty-eight commands.

In the New Testament the word law never means the Oral Law, but always the law in the Pentateuch; and it is still regarded as 'the expression of the holy and imperative will of God.' It is important to see what Jesus' attitude to the law really was, because on occasion it appears to be contradictory.

First, 'Jesus does not allow that the law, whatever its claims, can constitute a means of salvation.' The only means of salvation is the exclusive initiative of God. It is not man's conformity to the law which saves him but his acceptance into the Kingdom of God. It is against God alone that man has sinned, and it is 'God alone who can reinstate him.' But, second, in spite of that the law is fundamentally good, for 'it defines the conduct which a man can and must exhibit once he has accepted by faith his entry into the Kingdom.' A man's obedience to the law does not enable him to enter or re-enter into the covenant, but it does tell him whether or not he is within it. 'The law is like a thermometer, which indicates health or sickness, without in any way being a remedy.' It is not the will to obey the law which men lack, but the ability to obey it.

The trouble about the law is that by having the wrong idea of what obedience to it constitutes a man can deceive himself 'concerning his true situation before God.' For no amount of obedience to the law can entitle a man 'to dispense with repentance or to hold back the total gift of his person to God (present in Christ) and to his neighbour.' 'So far as the Kingdom of God is concerned, the Pharisee commits an error identical with that of a man who imagines that he may acquire nationality of a country by the sole fact that he has attempted to observe its laws. It is repentance and self-renunciation alone that procure that nationality.'

If that is Jesus' attitude to the law—and it is demonstrated that it is—then Paul's attitude is not new; it is precisely the attitude of Jesus.

It can be seen how rich the treatment of this subject is in this book. The book is a library in itself; and is written with such grace and clarity of style that scholar and layman alike will be able to use it. We hope that the courage of the publishers in issuing so comprehensive and authoritative a book will be rewarded as it deserves.

[1] Lutterworth Press; 30s. net.

Paul's Certainties

VI. God's Providential Care and Continual Help—Romans viii. 28

By H. G. Wood, D.D., Birmingham

'And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose' (R.V.).

'God worketh all things with them for good' (R.V.m.).

'We know that in everything God works with those who love him, whom he has called in accordance with his purpose, to bring about what is good' (Goodspeed).

'We know also that those who love God, those who have been called in terms of his purpose, have his aid and interest in everything' (Moffatt).

Obviously this passage affirms one of Paul's certainties, but a textual variant and differing possibilities of construing the Greek make the exact nature of the certainty affirmed somewhat obscure. The A.V. takes 'all things' as the subject of the verb 'work together', while the R.V.m. is based on a text which inserted 'God' as the subject of the verb and made 'all things' the object of the verb. Even without the insertion of 'God', 'He' rather than 'all things' should be the subject of the verb. Sanday and Headlam adopted the translation 'God causes all things to work together for good for them that love Him'. But though this is a possible rendering, it is unusual. 'To work with', to 'co-operate', does not normally require a direct object, and the accusative, 'all things', may be an accusative of respect, not a direct object. So E. J. Goodspeed, and James Moffatt understood it. 'God works with, co-operates with, those who love him, in everything'. The American R.S.V. confirms this. 'We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose'. C. H. Dodd in his commentary is emphatic in rejecting the A.V. and in following the alternative rendering. 'Whichever reading be adopted, the familiar translation is not an admissible rendering of the Greek. Paul did not write: "All things work together for good to them that love God". The literal translation is: "With those who love God, He (or, according to the other reading, "God") co-operates in all things for good". Dr. Moffatt has paraphrased this somewhat freely, but with fidelity to the meaning'. It may also be worth while to observe that some ambiguity attaches to the phrase 'for good'. The A.V. and Moffatt both suggest that 'the good' means the advantage, the true welfare, of them that love God. Goodspeed's rendering gives a wider scope to the phrase, and perhaps rightly relates it to the Divine purpose of bringing about what is good for the Church or for humanity. The good is not confined to what is best for those with whom God co-operates. We have not to choose between these two interpretations. Both may be intended.

The Christian's confidence in God's providential care and continual help has its roots in Jewish piety. The assurance that God overrules everything for good springs from the God-consciousness of Israel. The classical expression of it in the Old Testament is the saying of Joseph to his brethren: 'as for you, ye meant evil against me; but God meant it for good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive' (Gn 50^{20}). Rabbinic wisdom taught that one should always accustom oneself to say, 'All that the All-merciful does, He does for good.' By way of example Wetstein cites a story of Rabbi Akiba. 'On a journey he came to a certain city and asked for a lodging, but no one was willing to receive him. Then he said, Whatever God does, He does for good. So he went off and spent the night in the open country. He had with him a cock, an ass, and a lamp. A gust of wind put out the lamp: a cat ate the cock and a lion ate the ass. And Akiba said, Whatever God does, He does for good. That night a hostile band attacked the inhospitable city and took the citizens captive. And Rabbi Akiba said, Did I not tell you, God does all that He does for good?' Apparently the last saying is addressed to the unfortunate captives, but whether it was intended to encourage them, or whether it was a reflection to the effect that their discourtesy had worked for good in the Rabbi's case, is not quite clear. If it was addressed to companions or disciples, it must have been meant as an example of God overruling apparent misfortunes for the ultimate advantage of the sufferer. Those who mark providences will often have such experiences to record. I remember Rendel Harris telling me that when he and his wife were preparing to visit the stricken Armenian communities in Anatolia in 1897, they required a Russian visa for their passport, or it may have been Russian intervention to secure a Turkish visa. There was a delay for a fortnight in procuring the visa, and the delay at the time was a real distress to Rendel Harris. But when he

reached Aintab, he was able to hold a well-attended service in an Armenian church. They told him afterwards, 'You could not have held such a service a fortnight ago', and Rendel Harris felt he understood why in God's providence the visa had been delayed. This may seem a trivial example, but there is a wealth of experience behind the conviction that whatever God does, He does for a good end.

Paul's personal testimony to this certainty is memorably expressed in his letter to his friends in Philippi. His imprisonment and his being on trial for his life might seem to them an unmitigated disaster, but he sees that God has ordered this for good. 'Now I would have you know, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel; so that my bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole prætorian guard, and to all the rest; and that most of the brethren in the Lord, being confident through my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear' (Ph 1^{12-14}). Paul was certain that whatever happened to him would bring about what is good. Christ would be magnified in his body, whether by life or by death. And for himself, death would be gain.

It will not be out of place to recall at this point the parallel from Plato's *Republic*, book x. 613.A., which Wetstein adduces along with the Rabbinic parallels. Having laid it down that the just man will be loved by the gods and that whatever happens to him by Divine appointment, everything must turn out to be the best possible for him, Plato continues: 'So we must assume regarding the just man that, whether he is reduced to poverty or is subject to disease or any other apparent evil, in the end these things will issue in some good thing for such a man, living or dead. For the gods will never cease to care for one who earnestly desires to become just and by practising virtue to become as like to God as is possible for a man'. Plato is as convinced as Paul that for those whom the gods love, evils will be overruled for good. If Paul's certainty differs from Plato's, it will lie in his sense of being called in accordance with God's purpose. Socrates had experience of Divine guidance as well as an assurance of God's providential care, but he was not entrusted with the ministry of reconciliation, which the apostle to the Gentiles was called to exercise. Looking back, Paul felt himself to be the subject of a prophetic vocation. He believed that like Jeremiah, he had been separated or consecrated from birth, to be a prophet for the nations (cf. Gal 1^{15-16} with Jer 1^{5}). Like Jeremiah Paul is to pluck up and break down, to destroy and to overthrow as well as to build and to plant (cf. 2 Co 10^{3-6} with Jer 1^{10} and 45^{4}). The prophet is sustained by God's continual help. Paul could trace the guiding hand of God through his whole career. His zeal for the religion of his fathers which led him to persecute the young Christian Church had been used by God to prepare him for his mission to the Gentiles. His labours and sufferings were all directed to the furtherance of the gospel, and seemed in his eyes to be a God-given privilege. Through his weaknesses, God's strength was made manifest. He learned thereby his dependence on God's grace. So he could always rejoice, and whatever his outward circumstances might be, strong in the strength that Christ supplies, he could surpass the passionless self-sufficiency of the Stoic. He knew he had God's aid and interest in everything.

God works for good with those who love Him. Very rarely does Paul speak of men loving God. The expression is more characteristic of the First Epistle of John. The only other passage in which Paul actually refers to those who love God is the quotation from Is 64^{4} in 1 Co 2^{9}, where we read of 'the things which God hath prepared for them that love him'. But there is a Johannine expression in 1 Co 8^{3} which runs, 'If any man loves God, the same has been known by God'. Otherwise, Paul does not use the verb *ἀγαπᾶν* or the noun *ἀγάπη* of man's love for God. He almost confines these terms to man's love for his neighbour. It may not be without significance that when he defines the love that is the fulfilment of the Law, he concentrates on the second great commandment and is silent about the first (cf. Gal 5^{14}). Is this because, as Nygren suggests, man's relation to God is faith or trust, rather than love, according to Paul? Did Paul hesitate to claim to love God? He certainly speaks of his relation to Christ in terms of faith rather than love. 'The life that I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me' (Gal 2^{20}). It is Peter, not Paul, who speaks of Christians loving Jesus Christ whom they have not seen, though it should be noted that Peter at once associates or equates love and faith, for he continues, 'on whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly . . .' C. H. Dodd, in his commentary, suggests a similar hesitation in Paul about the use of the expression 'to love God'. 'We observe that Paul promises God's co-operation to those who love God, for which he then immediately substitutes "those who have been called in terms of His purpose". The reason of the substitution is not far to seek. To say, simply, that with those who love God He co-operates, might leave us free to suppose that by our love to Him we have merited His help. To suppose any such thing would be for Paul the last heresy. He is always turning our attention from

our own feeling, will and act to the will of God'. We may accept this comment and yet question whether, as Nygren seems to suggest, Paul ruled out the word ἀγάπη as inappropriate as a description of man's attitude towards God. If Paul preferred the word πίστις, we must not contrast the two words as if, in our experience, they could be divorced. It is true that in 1 Co 13 Paul distinguishes faith, hope and love and even imaginatively asserts the possibility of a faith devoid of love. But in fact, to try to separate the members of this triad is to repeat the fallacy of the old faculty psychology. Faith or trust in God is not true faith if it does not involve love. We must not so define ἀγάπη that it cannot be used to describe man's devotion to God.

It is more important to ask, what are the forms or expressions of man's love for God? To answer this question we must turn to the First Epistle of John, who is concerned to test the sincerity or genuineness of any who claim to love God. John begins by reversing, as it were, the proposition, love is the fulfilment of the Law. Keeping the commandments is the elementary expression of love. This is what loving God means, that we keep His commandments (1 Jn 5^5). So we read in the Wisdom of Solomon, 'to love wisdom is to keep her commandments', and so Jesus is recorded as saying in the Fourth Gospel, 'If ye love me, keep my commandments'. It is probable that the writer of the First Epistle of John had in mind Gnostic thinkers who claimed to know and love God in such a way that they were beyond good and evil as interpreted in ordinary morality, and were a law unto themselves, subject to no man's censure. But the true lover of God will be more, not less, sensitive in discharging his normal obligations and in his reverence for the fundamentals of morality as stated in the Decalogue. The man or woman who keeps one of the commandments or accepts the penalty of transgression at great personal cost, because the commandment is understood to be God's will, is loving God, however reluctant or even rebellious he or she may be. Possibly love of God expressed in a reluctant and difficult obedience is of more value than the love exhibited by those who delight in the Law of God because they have found by experience that God's commandments are not grievous and that the Lord's yoke is easy and His burden light.

If in the First Epistle of John, keeping the commandments is proposed as the first test of a man's claim to love God, the second is perhaps even more searching. It is love of the brethren, and the brethren will include our neighbours, our fellow-Christians and our fellow-men. When Paul chose the second great commandment as the fulfilment of the whole Law, he might well have had in mind the equivalent of John's thought, 'if a man does not love his brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen?' To love our neighbours, to love the brethren, is in effect to love God. This does not mean that the love of our neighbour and the love of God can be simply identified, or that the first can be regarded as a substitute for the second. If it be true that we cannot love God if we do not love our neighbours, it is also true that we cannot, in a full and adequate sense, love our neighbours if we do not love God. To quote the Epistle of John again, 'If we love God and keep His commandments, we can be more sure of loving God's children.' But Simone Weil's remarkable study of the *Forms of the Implicit Love of God* affords real illumination here. She suggests that 'the (indirect or) implicit love of God can only have three immediate objects, the only three things here below in which God is really though secretly present. These are religious ceremonies, the order and beauty of the world and our neighbour. Accordingly there are three loves'. She continues: 'To these three loves friendship should perhaps be added; strictly speaking, it is distinct from the love of our neighbours'. Though she does not in terms add keeping the commandments, yet this is involved in her exposition of love of our neighbour, for the creative attention which love for our neighbour demands that we show to one another, must include not only the Good Samaritan's care for the afflicted, but also the reformer's concern for social justice and the magistrate's concern for the right administration of the law. In what she says of love of the order and beauty of the world, Simone Weil develops a thought which has but small place in the New Testament. The scientist and the artist will be included among those who love God implicitly. It seemed to Simone Weil that in our modern world, 'the beauty of the world is the commonest, easiest and most natural way of approach', *i.e.* the most natural way for men to advance from an implicit to an explicit love of God. The third form of implicit love of God, the love of religious ceremonies, is to-day heavily discounted. 'Real love and respect for religious practices are rare even among those who are most assiduous in observing them, and are practically never to be found in others'.

While these two forms of the love of the beauty of the world, and the love of religious practices are not much in evidence in the Scriptures, they are not out of keeping with the faith of the Bible. Yet it is surely worth noting that the emphasis falls on love of our neighbour. It is possible to neglect the love of our neighbour if we are taken up with either of the other forms of implicit love. And, after all, implicit love is not enough, and

Paul was not thinking of those whose love of God is only indirect and not a fully conscious devotion. How does our implicit love become explicit? And here the answers of both John and Paul coincide. If we see in Jesus the Son of God, then we love the Father that begat him and the Son who has been begotten. To love Jesus is to love God, and this love is expressed primarily in an unshakeable trust. Our love of God is our response to the love of God who sent His son into the world to live and die and rise again for our salvation. The initiative is with God, and the act in which God reveals His purpose of mercy for us and all mankind is the sure ground of our confidence in His providential care and continual help. So Paul can write to his friends in Philippi and say, 'I am *sure* that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ' (Ph 1^6 [R.S.V.]). And of course the same certainty rings out triumphantly in the closing verses of Ro 8: 'For I *am sure* that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord' (R.S.V.).

Literature

KARL BARTH'S CHURCH DOGMATICS

A Christian Dogmatics must pay attention to the two matters which form the substance of this volume—Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics, II: The Doctrine of God*, Part 2 (T. and T. Clark; 55s. net). It is quite unusual, however, for them to be treated in juxtaposition and interrelation. Christian Ethics has tended to be treated as the poor relation among the members legitimately belonging to the Dogmatic family—some scattered references, and at the end a summary account, just as too many sermons are constructed with a final paragraph concerned with 'application.' Barth cannot be charged with such cavalier and unjust conduct, for here Ethics is written into the body of his Dogmatics in an altogether worthy way. It is in fact theologically tied to the other major theme of the volume, Election. Barth calls attention to the synopsis given at the head of Section 32: 'the doctrine of predestination is first and last and in all circumstances the sum of the Gospel: glad tidings' (p. 12). 'The doctrine of God must be expressly defined and developed and interpreted as that which it also is at every point, that is to say *ethics*' (p. 513). And God Himself (see the quotation below) is essentially One who elects. From this, Barth draws the conclusion that man is really *person* (p. 510), thus providing an adequate defence against much ill-considered criticism based on misinterpretation of his use of the term *Bestimmung*.

The five hundred pages of chapter 7 on the Election of God are of outstanding importance, both as a contribution to the subject and as determinative of what Barth has to say in volume IV on Reconciliation. Alone among dogmaticians, Barth gives Election precedence among all tenets concerning the work of God: 'God is none other than the One who in His Son or Word elects Himself, and in and with Himself elects His people' (p. 76). Against Calvin, for whom in the end Christ is the *fundamentum* of salvation but not of Election, Barth holds that in Christ 'we have to do not only with elected man but with the electing God' (p. 75). Further, 'the election of grace, as the election of Jesus Christ, is simultaneously the eternal election of the one community of God' (p. 195). The godless man is as such rejected by God. But 'this choice of the godless man is void,' since 'he belongs eternally to Jesus Christ and therefore is not rejected but elected by God in Jesus Christ' (p. 306).

Barth thus prepares us for both the magnitude and the objectivity of the work of Christ (see volume IV). That there are certain difficulties does not detract from the importance of what is said—there must always be difficulties when we speak of what D. M. Baillie calls 'the paradox of grace.' Three questions suggest themselves. Has the objectivity of Election been so construed as to blur the distinction between those inside and those outside the Church, between the believer and the godless?—further study of the volume may yield an answer. What is meant by the godless man's choice being void?—cf. the difficult conception of *das Nichtige* (volume III, Part 3). Does Barth's statement necessarily imply Universalism?—for definitive answer we must wait for volume V to appear.

JOHN K. S. REID

THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE

More than sixty years ago the late Sir Frederic Kenyon published a work which proved widely useful, and which during his life-time saw four editions and various reprintings. This work, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, has now been revised by A. W. Adams and has appeared in its fifth edition (Eyre and Spottiswoode; 42s. net).

A new lease of life may be confidently predicted for this excellent book, which is accurate and up-to-date, and which contains an abundance of information about the manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments, and about the ancient versions. Many new sources have come to light since the first edition appeared, and even since Sir Frederic's last revision. All are taken into account here. The Chester Beatty Papyri, and other papyrus fragments were already known when the fourth edition was prepared, but the Dead Sea Scrolls were then unknown, and even to-day are but partially published. These figure at various points in the present edition, which retains its continuity with the older editions, while changing what needed to be changed in the light of fuller knowledge, and adding wherever addition was called for. The work will be invaluable to students as a summary treatment of the materials available for the textual criticism of both Testaments, and all lovers of the Bible will learn much from it. Professor G. R. Driver contributes a short introduction, which briefly surveys the life and achievement of Sir Frederic Kenyon.

The study of the ancient versions has not stood still and the Beuron edition of the Old Latin and the Benedictine edition of the Vulgate have both either begun or continued to appear during the years since the fourth edition of this book was published. On p. 264 we are told that the Benedictine Vulgate has now reached Psalms, and 'now' is defined as 1953. A further issue has appeared since then, and in 1957 Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs became available. There has also been discussion on the nature and origin of the Septuagint Version, and part of Professor Kahle's Schweich Lectures on 'The Cairo Geniza' were devoted to the study of this question. The views of Professor Kahle are here summarized, though the author shows caution in assessing them.

The English versions of the Bible are also included in this work, and here again the reader will learn not only about the early English Versions, but about the American Revised Standard Version, and the new translation which is now in course of preparation in Britain.

There is an Appendix which gives a list of notable variant readings of Biblical texts, and this will be found instructive and valuable. It is interesting to reflect that whereas, as we are informed on p. 55, 'no fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith rests on a disputed reading,' the sensational doctrines attributed to the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls nearly all rest on passages which are either defective or cryptic, the interpretation of which is therefore problematical.

H. H. Rowley

THREE BOOKS ON BUDDHISM

The little book by Maurice Percheron—*Buddha and Buddhism*, tr. by Edmund Stapleton (Longmans; 6s.)—might be described as an encyclopaedia of Buddhism on a small scale. It is lavishly illustrated, but is so condensed that it is almost impossible to derive from it a comprehensive conception of Buddhism. The author wins confidence by his scholarship and patient investigation and by the width of his range, covering the whole temporal development of Buddhism from India to the countries of the Far East. But the picture he gives us is not very attractive, and suggests a concept of life which is almost entirely negative and agnostic. His efforts to distinguish *Nirvana* from Nothingness are not very successful nor are they altogether fair to Buddhism.

Our second book—*The Doctrine of the Buddha*, by George Grimm (Allen and Unwin; 42s. net)—differs from the former in being too long rather than too short and dwells upon details which are a temptation to irrelevance. It is the work of a devoted adherent of Buddhism who sometimes allows his enthusiasm to put assertion in the place of proof. On the whole it is expository rather than critical, but his exposition is often beautiful and constantly evokes appreciation even though it does not lead to agreement. With great minuteness and attractive insight Mr. Grimm expounds the 'four most excellent truths' of Buddhism—the truth of suffering, the cause of suffering, the removal of suffering and the path to victory. But he cannot get away from the conclusion that it is by negation chiefly that victory is won. He claims that the annihilation of will is the solution of all unhappiness, and that complete will-lessness brings unlimited satisfaction. This would seem to be almost too obvious, for if a man does not will anything he can never be unsatisfied.

A further double claim is made. It is urged that the doctrine of the Buddha is the flower of Indian thought, but this would hardly meet with universal acceptance amongst Indian religionists, although it is supported in the book still to be reviewed. The other argument, that in Buddhism we have the reconciliation between science and religion which modern conditions of thought require, is attractively set forth, but we are still left with the feeling that the unity claimed as the goal of the many spiritual and intellectual pilgrimages of mankind is unity of negation. It may bring a great peace, but it is disturbingly like the peace of a desert. In the 'flight of the alone to the Alone' true happiness comes from the discovery that we are not alone.

Our third book—*In Days of Great Peace*, by Mouni Sadhu (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net)—is not connected explicitly with Buddhism, and shows a

greater catholicity than the one just considered. It might be taken as a particular example of the results of spiritual concentration on Buddhistic lines, and there is a similar difficulty in avoiding negation. The author is a European who, after trying various forms of yogic practice and coming considerably under the influence of theosophy, finds his spiritual home in a community which had gathered round a great Indian ascetic, Ramana Maharshi. With poignant and beautiful enthusiasm he describes the influence of the Master upon him, and comes to regard him as a living embodiment of religious truth. The influence is personal and reaches the disciple chiefly in periods of silence when he seems to be united with the spirit of his teacher and through him reaches the All where lies the only Reality. The author says little of Indian philosophy, but is obviously sympathetic towards the Vedânta and therefore gives a more positive interpretation of the absolute Reality than does the average follower of the Buddha.

W. S. URQUHART

SYMBOLISM IN MARK'S GOSPEL

Preaching the Cross, by the Rev. J. C. Fenton (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net), is a highly theological book, designed to meet a highly practical end. Mr. Fenton is dissatisfied with the usual way of carrying out the Good Friday Three Hours' Service, as, for instance, by a series of sermons on 'The Seven Words from the Cross.' He sees a far better way to carry out that service in a study of the meaning of Mk 14^{1}–16^{8}. But to say that is to say little about the general standpoint of this book.

Mr. Fenton says: 'Writers on St. Mark's Gospel (and there have been many of them recently) can be roughly divided into two groups. There are those who think that this Gospel is carefully arranged and ordered; that the author was a theologian and writer of some skill; and that some of his narrative is symbolic. And there are others who think that Mark is a rough-and-ready Gospel, full of awkwardness, slips, and repetitions; and that there is no further meaning beyond the narrative sense.' Mr. Fenton most definitely aligns himself with the first point of view, a point of view which, of course, Austin Farrer and R. H. Lightfoot have ably propounded.

On this view practically everything in Mark—or any other Gospel—becomes symbolic, with a meaning beyond itself. Take the case of two names. 'It is *Judas*, who gave his name to Judea and to Judaism, who hands Jesus over. He acts as the representative of the nation, his own, who received him not, but handed him over to the Romans for destruction.' '*Barabbas*' condition is typical of our condition as sinners; he was a *prisoner*, and so are we; a *rebel*, as we are rebels against God; *bound*, as we are bound by sin; a *murderer*, as we commit murder in our hearts. This "Son of the Father" stands for all of us.' These instances are mild. A much more elaborate instance is the interpretation of Mk 13 as outlining what did happen to Jesus as well as would happen to the Church.

Any criticism of a book written from this point of view must be subjective. If this point of view is correct, no one can really understand what Mark is all about without a mass of scholarship behind him. Certainly if this point of view is right, the Papias tradition that Mark is the preaching material of Peter is totally wrong. Again, if this point of view is correct, then any interpreter can make Mark mean practically anything, and no one can really say that he is wrong. We are back at that vicious allegorism which makes words mean what the interpreter chooses that they should mean.

Of the scholarship and the devotion of this book there is no doubt. I myself think its whole point of view and method of approach totally mistaken, but, while being compelled to say this, I am bound also to say that there are others who will find it as profoundly right as I regard it as profoundly wrong. Therefore, however much I disagree with this book, I unhesitatingly commend it to those of both points of view as an excellent example of the school to which it belongs.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

AMOS

Were the canonical prophets a continuation of the old Canaanite 'prophets'? In particular, what kind of a prophet was Amos? Was he, indeed, a prophet at all? It all depends, as has been said many times, what we mean by the word 'prophet.' These questions are discussed by Professor John D. W. Watts in his 1955 Faculty Lectures at the Baptist Theological Seminary at Rüschlikon, Zürich. The title is *Vision and Prophecy in Amos* (Brill, Leiden; 9.00 guilders). The suggestion is adopted that the Canaanite cult-prophets at the shrines were not whole-time men, but that some of them at least appeared at the big feasts, especially the autumnal New Year Feast. Thus Professor Watts can provide a full cultic background to the prophecies and can base the eschatology on the full myth-ritual pattern as set forth in 'Myth and Ritual' (ed. S. H. Hooke). Amos did not reckon himself to be a prophet, but God called him and made him to be one. The author follows A. Weiser's two-book theory and elaborates his own variant of it (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxvi. [January, 1955] 109–112). The book is a very useful study of prophetism, and

almost all the relevant authorities are cited. But the Hebrew printing has gone sadly wrong, and in almost every case there is a mistake, sometimes quite serious. I have counted nineteen.

NORMAN H. SNAITH

CHRISTIAN BELIEF

The current problem of the meaningfulness of Christianity for the contemporary world provides the theme for two short books. One is Mr. John Wilson's *Language and Christian Belief* (Macmillan; 9s. 6d. net). The author, who is still in his twenties, teaches religion to the sixth form of a well-known school in the south of England. He is therefore fully exposed to the questions which intelligent young people are asking, and he believes that they are 'questions to which Christians should have satisfactory answers.'

These questions arise in the context of the prevailing logical empiricism, a philosophy in which the author has himself been trained and to the principles of which he gives assent. His contention is that 'religious statements are informative, and are ultimately verifiable by a special type of experience, namely religious experience or experience of the supernatural.' The debatable point here is, of course, the appeal to 'a special type of experience.' Those who have no experience of the supernatural may, in spite of what the author says, remain unconvinced about the possibility of such experience. In any case, it is something very different from our ordinary everyday sense-experiences.

The second half of the book is devoted to the logical analysis of specific Christian doctrines. The aim is not to show that these doctrines are true, but that they are at least free from logical absurdity. On the whole, the author does a good job here in the way of clarification. One misses any reference to alienation in his discussion of sin. His analogy of the wicket made out of three stumps, in his chapter on the Trinity, has the advantage of being percussive, but it tells us no more than Saint Patrick's classic illustration of the three-leaved shamrock. Nevertheless, there is justification for the author's claim that though the mystery of Christian doctrine remains, 'it is no longer a logical mystery.'

With the mention of mystery, we pass to Professor Hugh T. Kerr's paper-back, *Mystery and Meaning in the Christian Faith* (Ryerson Press, Toronto; $1.00 net). In these four lectures Professor Kerr does not expose himself to contemporary secular thought in nearly so radical a way as Mr. Wilson does. Indeed, he makes no mention of logical empiricism at all. But he is concerned with what is fundamentally the same kind of problem—how to make Christianity meaningful in a secular matter-of-fact world, and yet to preserve the essentially mysterious and supernatural character of the Christian religion.

The author begins by noting that in St. Paul mystery and meaning go together—the mystery is somehow illuminated by meaning, but the meaning is always surrounded by a 'penumbra of mystery.' Christian theology has sometimes stressed meaning at the expense of mystery, sometimes mystery at the expense of meaning. The former emphasis has been especially typical of Protestantism. The author calls for a rehabilitation of symbolism, which can express both the meaning and the mystery. But discussions of symbolism are peculiarly dangerous. We may accept that 'water is a basic universal archetype,' but it is surely far-fetched to argue, as the author does, that when water is no longer sanctified by the Church in baptism, we see the pre-occupation with this archetype springing forth 'in distorted ways,' such as the craze for aquatic sports, the cult of tiled bathrooms, and the like. But apart from such aberrations, we may accept the author's call for a judicious combination of mystery and meaning in the presentation of the Christian faith—always provided that mystery is not equated with mystification.

JOHN MACQUARRIE

BISHOP AND PRESBYTERY

An interest that is almost topical attaches to *Bishop and Presbytery*, by Mr. Walter Roland Foster of St. Andrew's Theological Seminary, Manila (S.P.C.K.; 25s. net). The author is an American who has not yet visited Scotland, but he has been well guided in his research, and his knowledge of the Church of Scotland in the period surveyed—from the Restoration to the Revolution—is both wide and detailed.

Previous study of this period has concentrated on the clash between the civil and ecclesiastical establishment and the Covenanters—a deplorable yet glorious story. Mr. Foster, however, remembering that, while about one-third of the ministers in 1660 refused to conform, those who did conform were fully two-thirds, concentrates on the partial fusion of the Presbyterian and Episcopal systems which ensued. He studies this in detail, drawing largely on the records of northern synods and presbyteries, and shows among other things that a conspicuous part of Church life from 1661 to 1688 was the continuity of the Presbyterian discipline in kirk-session and presbytery. There was, indeed, a remarkable synthesis of Episcopal order with Calvinist doctrine and discipline. Since no General Assembly or National Synod met, the diocesan

synods had the character of a legislature rather than a disciplinary court. Synodical decisions were enacted by the bishop ' with consent of the brethren of the synod ' ; yet the bishop had a veto over any action of the synod, and his disciplinary authority over the ministers, together with his status in the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the government, put him in a commanding position. On the other hand, the bishop was firmly in the grip of royal absolutism ; and it seems that the Act of 1669 affirming the King's supremacy over all persons and in all causes ecclesiastical was primarily aimed not at the nonconforming ministers but at the establishment and especially the bishops. This is an important book which every student of the period will welcome for its new line of approach and its ecumenical temper in the discussion of a history that still arouses denominational emotion.

We have noted misprints on pages 72 and 102, and to the excellent bibliography we should add Dr. G. B. Burnet's *The Story of Quakerism in Scotland*.

STEWART MECHIE

The Rev. Donald G. Miller, Professor of New Testament at Union Theological College, Richmond, Virginia, himself in great demand as a guest preacher, has written *The Way to Biblical Preaching* (Abingdon Press ; $2.50). It is a follow-up to his previous book ' Fire in thy Mouth.' It contains much sound advice to the preacher. It counsels him to buy good commentaries rather than volumes of sermons. He must strive to do justice to his text, be it long or short. There are too many sermons to-day to which the text has little more relation than a motto which is never even repeated.

The words of the text and context must be carefully studied and the intention of the passage understood, otherwise the sermon may be something quite remote from, and even contradictory of, what the sacred writer meant. Examples of this are given. The preacher must make sure what the passage meant for those to whom it was first addressed, and then proceed to show its relevance to the contemporary scene. It must aim at bringing men face to face with God, and challenge a decision. The theme of the sermon must be the theme of the passage on which it is based, and if the passage suggests more than one theme, balance must be kept. Above all, fire will be kindled in the hearers only if there be fire in the preacher.

Melanchthon has always had a bad press. Written off as a mere mouthpiece of Luther, condemned as a traitor to Luther, regarded as too friendly to Rome, held to be a crypto-Calvinist, he has suffered both from attention and from neglect. We welcome therefore *Melanchthon the Quiet Reformer*, by Professor Clyde L. Manschreck, Ph.D., of Duke University (Abingdon Press ; $6.00).

It is the first biography of the great Lutheran theologian to appear in English in the present century, and it is both clearly written and fully documented. Dr. Manschreck finds the key to the mystery of Melanchthon in the fact that, belonging both to the Renaissance and to the Reformation, he recognized that human beings are finite and never have final truth. Thus while he clung to the light he had, he was willing to learn. This handsomely produced volume is a real contribution to the understanding of an influential figure of the Reformation era.

Introduction to Philosophy, by Professor G. T. W. Patrick, Ph.D., revised with the assistance of Dr. F. Miller Chapman (Allen and Unwin ; 32s. net), was first published some thirty years ago, and is well worthy of republication. It is a useful clarification of existing knowledge rather than brilliant, and will be of great assistance to students preparing for examination and anxious to obtain what the author calls ' a bowing acquaintance ' with philosophy. But it will serve the purposes of older scholars also, who wish to have by them an outline of philosophical development which will save them from being overwhelmed by the welter of recent publications. It is slightly naïve, and would be improved by following the lines of some of the latest Gifford Lectures on kindred topics. It suffers from excessive repetition, but this perhaps adds to its usefulness.

The author is optimistic, and in his preface to the new edition expresses the hope that ' the last traces of dogmatism are disappearing from philosophy, and the last traces of arrogance from science.' His own comprehensive and fair-minded summary will certainly contribute to pacification and perhaps to unification, although a clearer indication of the plan of the book as a whole would be very valuable. He lays stress on personality which ' represents the acme of complexity and yet the perfection of reality.' His chapter on the ' Theory of Morals ' is specially good. His fundamental belief is that in our conception of the total organization of the cosmos we should rely on ' pull ' rather than ' push ' and that, on this understanding, our creed might be : ' God is the soul of the world, a spiritual presence, a creative, organizing and perfecting power.'

Few can write about evangelism with more authority than the Rev. Alan Walker of Australia. Behind his book, *The Whole Gospel for the Whole World* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott ; 8s. 6d. net),

lies much experience of evangelistic campaigns in various parts of the world and, in particular, his work as director of the Mission to the Nation in Australia. In regard to both the content and method of evangelism he challenges those who continue traditional ways and call them contemporary. The larger part of the book is positive, and while there seems more to be said about the substance of twentieth-century evangelism, Mr. Walker is at his best in describing methods which are proving of value to-day. This book makes no small contribution to the solving of the problem of communication.

The itinerant evangelist may well do his most effective work by listening to and answering questions. This has been the experience of the Rev. Ivor Powell, who has gathered his answers in a volume, *This I Believe* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott ; 10s. 6d. net). Mr. Powell has no doubts as to what he believes and expresses it clearly and pungently. The standpoint is that of conservative evangelicalism with some occasional concessions to the results of critical study. The book lacks any clear outline and does not distinguish between the predication of ' I believe in ' to, for example, God and evangelism.

Comparative Liturgy, by Anton Baumstark (Mowbray ; 35s. net), can scarcely be regarded as a book which is easy to read, but it will amply repay careful study. No serious student of Christian Worship can afford not to possess it. Here is an up-to-date and essential handbook for liturgical studies. Anton Baumstark, who died in 1948, was a scholar of immense erudition, and it was the scope of his knowledge of the various rites which enabled him to apply effectively the comparative method in liturgics. In 1953 the third French edition was published, the editor being that great Benedictine scholar, Dom Bernard Botte, of the Abbey of Mont César, Louvain. He added various footnotes, verified and completed the documentation, and supplemented the bibliography, both in the text and in the Appendix. It should be noted that the Bibliographical Appendix is a mine of information. It is indeed all this documentation, brought up-to-date, which is one of the most important features of the book and which makes it an indispensable companion. Now the work has been translated by Dr. F. L. Cross, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford, who has done so much for liturgics in particular as secretary of the First and Second International Conferences on Patristic Studies held at Oxford in 1951 and 1955. Dr. Cross places us all still further in his debt by making conveniently available to English-speaking readers the work of a Continental master.

Christian Obedience in the University, by Professor J. Davis McCaughey (S.C.M. ; 25s. net), has as its sub-title ' Studies in the life of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland 1930–1950.' The author, now Professor of Biblical Studies at Ormond College, Melbourne, was on the staff of the Movement before the War and again from 1946 to 1951, and can therefore write with considerable inside knowledge. The main topics discussed are the impact on the student mind of world affairs and of the social distress of the 'thirties, the new self-consciousness about the place of the universities in our society and about the place of the Christian in the university, the relation of the Movement to the Church and the question of vocation.

There is much acute analysis and generalization here and in many ways this is a brilliant piece of work. One seems to detect, however, in the author a certain persistence of undergraduate intolerance. Things that he does not understand or like, be they Mysticism or Social Credit, are dismissed as ' crankiness.' The book can be commended, and not only to former members of the S.C.M.

Principal J. Stafford Wright has re-issued in revised form two lectures, one of which was first published some years ago, and the other of which was delivered six years ago, though not published until now. One of these deals with *The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem* (Tyndale Press ; 1s. 6d. net), and the other with *The Building of the Second Temple* (Tyndale Press ; 1s. 6d. net). In the former the author frees his case from some of the embarrassments to which attention had been drawn by his critics, and much improves his case for the traditional order of Ezra and Nehemiah. Nevertheless some embarrassments remain. The author supposes that Ezr 9^{9} refers to the walls whose building is recorded in Ezr 4^{7-23}. It is hard to see how Ezra could refer with satisfaction to walls whose completion was so ignominiously stopped. He also supposes that Ezra arrived in Jerusalem in 458 B.C., and later returned to Babylon, but came back to Jerusalem in 445 B.C., after Nehemiah's arrival, when at last he began to discharge the royal commission to enforce the law he had been sent to enforce. The other lecture deals with the problems attaching to the accounts of the return from captivity. Here the author rejects the account of 1 Esdras, where it differs from the Book of Ezra, and argues that there was a return from Babylon in 537 B.C., and that the building of the Temple was begun then, but that little was done until 520 B.C. Less acute problems attach to the issues here, and the author's views would be widely shared.

Devotional and Pastoral Classics

Letters from Baron von Hügel to a Niece[1]

By the Right Reverend John T. Hughes, the Bishop of Croydon

Those of us who take up this short selection of von Hügel's Letters for the first time should first understand what it is they set out to do. They were written for the spiritual direction of his niece. 'Spiritual direction' is a technical term of ascetic theology which is in constant need of being recovered from debasement and misuse. There are those to whom it suggests an unlawful interference of one soul by another, or an attempt to systematize the Christian way and to force souls into a prescribed pattern in an attempt to produce a final product of standard design. It suggests this because in the hands of the ignorant or the unwary practitioner, this is exactly what has happened. The result has been a great loss to the Church as a whole and to countless individual members of it in particular. Spirituality has remained generally mediocre. The good spiritual director is always needed, and he is always somewhat difficult to find.

What is 'spiritual direction' and what kind of person is the good 'spiritual director'? The first thing that this little volume should do is to give clear answers to both of these important questions, and for those for whom either of these is an important question, this book is indispensable. But before either of them can be answered, there is, of course, a previous question to be faced. What is the 'spiritual life'? We know ourselves as mind and as body; but what do we mean when we speak of ourselves as 'spirit'? Von Hügel would undoubtedly say that the essence of 'spirit' is *freedom*. There is a description of the 'spiritual man in Jn 3^8: 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit'. It tells us that to be spiritual is to be open and exposed in freedom to the richness and the expansiveness of an upward and an onward call from God of unlimited possibility and unpredictable surprise. Each man must discover the way of that call for himself, for it is his way and no one can find it for him. But can he find it unaided? Von Hügel would say no. No one can ever find the fullness of the range of his spiritual life alone. Life, and that includes our 'spiritual life', is not itself and cannot be realized except in relationship. We need each other to help us find our way. It is part of our 'creatureliness' that it should be so. Though the paths we shall individually tread are all different, the goal is the same and the landscape can be plotted by those who study it carefully. The 'spiritual director' is the man who knows what is the goal of the spiritual life, who has learnt by his own journeyings and by his acquaintance with the journeyings of others what the landscape is like, and who thereby earns the capacity to point out the likely way for other travellers who care to consult him, yet always leaving it to them to make their own discovery at their own proper rate, as the Holy Spirit shall direct. Two kinds of people ought therefore to read this book: those whose task and privilege it is to guide individual souls towards the attainment of that spiritual maturity and freedom which God desires them to have; and those who already having begun their spiritual journey now find themselves in need of expert help. No one knows what the going is like better than von Hügel, and no other writer gives better or more detailed or more experienced direction than he does in this small volume of his letters.

For Baron von Hügel the spiritual life begins with God. That, of course, goes without saying. But what he says that needs so very much to be said, and to be said very often, is that we have to begin with the right God and with right notions about Him. It is Paul Tillich who in our day has reminded us that God is not just the last term in a process of logical thought, but that He is 'wholly other' however much we rightly think of Him as wholly near. Von Hügel a generation ago pointed to the same truth as the only possible starting point in Christian thinking.

'But as to God, we can, indeed, be sure, very sure, of Him—He is implied in all our thinking, feeling, willing, doing; it is the implicit faith in the reality and the useful work of truth, of goodness,

[1] Edited with an Introduction by Gwendolen Greene.

of life which will never die out for long amongst mankind. And we can, we do, gain vivid experience of Him, if only we will die, die, day and night, to self. We can thus increasingly *apprehend* Him—can know really about Him, the head, the source of all reality and of all sense of reality. But we cannot encircle Him, map Him out, exhaustively explain Him' (p. 135).

Yet though He is 'wholly other', He is our true 'home', to whom we essentially belong. Prayer, which is the primary activity of the soul, is coming 'home'. And though no man has ever reverenced all the God-given faculties of reason and feeling and imagination with which man is endowed more than has von Hügel, or stressed more than he the need for their fullest exercise if the life of 'expansion' in God is to be realized, yet the primary activity of the soul before God is not speculation or discursive reasoning, but *adoration*. This leads him to say many things in the course of these letters about the nature of prayer and about the 'costly' process of learning how to pray well. Adoration and the acquiring of a loving simplicity of silence before God are not in the beginning of the prayer life but in the end, and are only found brokenly along the way. The aspirant will have to avoid two dangers: that of giving up altogether or of contenting himself with something less 'costing'; and that of overstraining the spiritual faculties and of going beyond the limits of his present capacity. In all this he is the surest guide, for he knows out of his own experience the truth of what he has to say.

'I am sure you already know well that you must evade all straining, all vehemence, all, as it were, putting your nerves into it. On the contrary the attention wanted is a leisurely expansive one—a dropping gently of all distractions, of obsessions, etc. . . . This old scribbler—how much of that dropping, evading, gently waiting—as against his interior vehemences and uproar, a sterile and sterilizing restlessness—he has to practise! Yet the practice shows him plainly (in the long run) that *that* is what good sense and God want of him: peace and power come *that* way and only that way' (p. 104).

All that von Hügel has to tell us about the way of prayer—with its alternation between the 'formless' and the 'vocal', with its inevitable 'flinty furlongs' when the going is very hard, dry and apparently unrewarding, and as the price of achievement a 'costingness' which has always to be paid '*in the body*', is what he holds to be true of life as a whole. Life has to be taken as it is, and prayer being an activity of living, though the primary activity, follows the inevitable course of all living. Nothing in life remains constant for very long and the way forward is always more of a zig-zag than a straight line. Human nature being selfish and set upon its own comfort likes to take the line of least resistance, and if the going becomes hard, starts to seek out comfortable evasions. But the spiritual life—maturity, expansion, freedom—is not to be found in a careful selectiveness of experience or in any kind of self-protectiveness, but is in saying 'Yes' to the whole of life with a joyful and hopeful and thankful going out to meet it: 'Everything, *everything* at once, sweetened in the love of God—of Christ' (p. 131). Life is learning to take everything as it comes, looking for the blessing enclosed in everything there is. 'Fastidiousness' is always to be guarded against, for it precludes the wholesome disciplines which make for the greatest of all spiritual achievements—'elasticity', 'accessibility', 'lightness', 'freedom'.

Within prayer itself therefore, because it is of a piece with all our experience of life and cannot be separated from it, there are hindrances, distractions, frustrations, which are part of the 'givenness', the 'happenedness' of life. And if freedom and expansion and enlargement of spiritual apprehension is to be found first in knowing God and in being exposed to Him, it is found next in reverencing and in welcoming the 'isness' of things. Progress can be by no other way than by the way things are and have to be. His niece writes because this troubles her, and so he replies and speaks of 'the stress of dryness and darkness, and what to do then, I know—oh, well, well—what that means. And I do not doubt that with your special temperament, such times must be peculiarly trying. But—mark this well, Child—*irreplaceably profitable*. If you but gently persevere through them, you will come out at the other end of the gloom, sooner or later, into ever deeper, tenderer day' (p. 85).

This quotation contains another important insight which is of the utmost importance for those who are called upon to offer the service of spiritual direction faithfully. We have each a 'special temperament', an '*attrait*', and that too is part of the 'givenness of life' which it would be both harmful and wasteful to ignore. To learn to recognize this means that we shall come rightly to understand ourselves and then to understand others. Only then shall we know where our best service to them lies. More than once in these letters he tells us how long it has taken him to learn the lesson of himself, to discover how best to work and at what rate, so as not to overstrain himself and presumptuously to go beyond his capacity. This might sound perilously near to the 'fastidiousness' which he elsewhere deplores, but it is, of course, nothing of the kind. It is the mark not only of common sense, but of discernment and

a rare Christian humility. It is all part of the healthy discipline of facing the facts and reverencing and accepting them joyfully.

'There is certainly a great art in managing one's nervous energy. I have myself, all my life, had to coax, and by various circumvendifuges get my work out of my restive kittle-cattle machinery' (p. 80).

Respect for oneself—and then respect for others. It is here that we come upon something that is distinctively great in von Hügel, a quality so essentially Christian and yet so rarely to be seen. He was a devout and a devoted Roman Catholic, and when he wrote these letters to his niece, she was an Anglican. Yet he never sought to change her allegiance. He respected what she was, not grudgingly, but genuinely and wholeheartedly, and sought only to help her to realize what she was capable of.

'I wonder if you have seen how much you will be called on to help people—to help souls. The golden rule is, to help those we love to escape from us; and never try to begin to help people, or influence them, till they ask, but wait for them. Souls are never dittos. The souls thus to be helped are mostly at quite different stages from our own, or they have quite a different *attrait*. One should wait silent for those who do not open out to us, who are not intended, perhaps, ever to be helped by us—except by our prayers (the best of all helps). . . . There are such differences of soul! Some people are like geometrical patterns. They worship in wide geometrical lines. Others worship a light that fringes off into darkness. Don't try to be like other people, or to make them like you. Puck may want to be a cat, but he can't be a cat. It would be a great pity if he could become a cat. I must wear my own top-hat, and also I must not kick any one else's top-hat' (p. xxix).

We must accept God as He is and not as we suppose Him to be. We must accept ourselves as we are and not as we choose to be; we must accept people as they are and not as we prefer them to be. And we must accept life as it is and not as we think it ought to be. For this is the truth and God is only known in the truth of things. There is that same robustness of thought and generosity of heart in von Hügel's reverence and zest for life—life in its fullness and wholeness—that we find in John Oman. There is goodness and truth everywhere for God cannot be confined. If he was 'one who has tried to live the *Confessions* at their deepest these last fifty years' and drew the greatest inspiration from S. Francis de Sales, Fénelon and the Abbé Huvelin, he received much profit from William Law and Dean Church.

'And then on Tuesday evening my great friend, Professor Kemp Smith of Edinburgh,[1] came home here with me for two nights. The two full days of his stay required all my strength for my talks with him—a large, religious soul as well as a highly-trained intellect. He said a number of striking things. That the age of the largest spiritual mortality amongst men was in middle life. That he had first been struck with this when a great gathering of all its past and present students took place at Princeton University, U.S.A. You had to pass over the young men, some of whom, indeed, looked unsettled, uncertain, but not lost to faith and heroism, and to move on to the men in their forties: and, alas, how many self-centred, dried-up, all-to-pieces, cynical countenances! Then what piercing insight into souls he has got! . . .' (p. 100f.).

He found saints in 'all kinds of disguises,' and hated that any one should despise or ignore the goodness and the beauty of God anywhere.

'Our Lord tells us not to put out the smoking flax, not to break the bruised reed—and yet I always see *this*. God makes lovely little flowers grow everywhere, but someone always comes and sits on them' (p. x).

If the spiritual life is by the way first of affirmation, it has also, of course, to tread the way of negation. There must always be the life of interior ascetic discipline. Where shall the disciplines be found which strengthen the will and train the affections, and which make for lightness, elasticity, expansion and growth? They are always to hand, just where we are. Bound up with the 'givenness' of life are the irritations and frustrations, the monotonies and the humiliations that are the substance of our daily cross. And there are always the temptations of over-complexity, overstrain, impatience, rush, evasion. How shall we make the best of all these? Again the answer is that it is by positive rather than by negative action. We must quietly drop and go on dropping what encumbers our freedom, and cleave the complexity of life with a centrality of purpose, a simplicity of desire, and a quietly sustained persistence of effort, without strain or violence.

'My Gwen: my doings have cost me a good deal: I know why. The fact is that like all three of my daughters, I have a very vehement, violent, over-impressionable nature, which, on such occasions, gets ridiculously over-roused, jarred, confused. Hence I have then a big job (quite apart from all visible doings) to drop, drop, drop all this feverishness, and to listen, as docilely as I can, to think, will and pray, with only "la fine pointe de l'esprit," as St. François de Sales and Fénelon never weary in recommending. I tell you this, Child, because I am sure you are much

[1] Brought up a Presbyterian.

like that yourself, and hence may encourage you along the same path of a most necessary stillness and peace. The minute I at all attain to these dispositions, fruitfulness succeeds to fever. So with Gwen ! ' (p. 101 f.)

' Yet always would I expect to find you to grow more by feeding the quiet within you than by direct self-examinings or self-fightings. These two latter things also to exist in your life—but much less, less centrally than the feeding of the quiet and the loving of God, Christ, and others in it ' (p. 141).

In conclusion, a word might be added for those who come to read von Hügel for the first time. His father was an Austrian diplomat and his mother a Scotswoman. But although he lived all his life in England he never acquired an easy, even an English, literary style. His constructions are German, and in English, clumsy, heavy and often ungrammatical. But that does not matter. One soon gets into the way of it. Quite a large part of these Letters is taken up with what he provided for his niece to read, much of it from Greek and Roman authors in translation. For the ordinary reader this is dull and heavy going, except for one thing. He constantly tells her not only what to read, but *why* and *how*, and what he says about these last two matters is of lasting importance. The way therefore to read von Hügel is the way he suggests we always do read: ' ruminatingly ', ' gradually ', ' deeply ', ' ploddingly as up a mountain side ', ' not demanding constant light ', ' leaving what does not help us ', with a quiet thankfulness for what we are given to see which is always rich and sustaining enough, and ' as to possible further truths and facts, we will leave ourselves peacefully docile and open ' (p. 24).

That is the way to read. And that is also for von Hügel the way to live.

' We live in times of such obvious transition, decline, poverty of deep, creative conviction, of such excess of analysis over synthesis—that it is in the air all around us to ask questions, to poke about, to wonder, to drift, to use the microscope ; where to become and to be, to produce reality, to adore and to will, and to see things in the large and upon the whole, and at their best, is what we all require ' (p. 134).

Contributions and Comments

The Designation ' The Golden Rule '

Who first applied the designation ' The Golden Rule ' to the precept enunciated in Mt 7^{12} ? The name is no doubt, as F. L. Cross's recently published *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* declares, a modern designation for our Lord's precept. But how modern is it, and who first struck it off ?

The first author cited in Murray's *New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* as having used ' The Golden Rule,' [1] was an American writer at the end of the last century, William Dean Howells. In his novel, *The Rise of Silas Lapham*, Howells writes, ' In our dealings with each other we should be guided by the Golden Rule ' (II. xxv.).

The name ' The Golden Rule,' however, occurs at least a century earlier than 1885, the date of the publication of Howells' novel. The earliest occurrence which the present writer has been able to find is in the writings of Edward Gibbon. In his discussion of Calvin and Servetus, Gibbon makes the following mock-heroic protestation : ' I am more deeply scandalized at the single execution of Servetus, than at the hecatombs which have blazed in the *auto-da-fés* of Spain and Portugal. . . . A Catholic inquisitor yields the same obedience which he requires, but Calvin violated the golden rule of doing as he would be done by . . .' (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, footnote near the close of ch. 54).

Is this the first time that the epithet was used in English literature ? From the almost stereotyped manner of Gibbon's reference to it, one would suppose that he was alluding to some well-worn cliché. Perhaps some reader of these lines can trace its origin more precisely than the present writer has done.

Bruce M. Metzger

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.

[1] According to Murray, earlier authors had used the expressions ' Golden Law ' (Robert Godfrey in 1674), and ' golden principle ' (Isaac Watts in 1741) of Jesus' precept.

Some Comments on Matthew x. 34–36 and Luke xii. 51–53

Dr. Farrer has suggested (' On Dispensing with Q ' in *Studies in the Gospels*) that the Q material is

better explained, not on the Q hypothesis, but on the hypothesis that Luke knew and used Matthew. The aim of this examination is to test Farrer's hypothesis by devoting careful attention to a very small sector of the Q material. If Farrer's hypothesis breaks down under this test, this will not prove that Farrer is mistaken but only indicate the need for an exhaustive re-examination of the whole Q material before his far-reaching suggestion can be accepted.

A convenient starting-point is the undisputed fact that most commentators [1] have assumed that these verses derived originally from Q; that they have been subject to some editorial revision by the authors of both Gospels, and that the Matthean form is nearer the original Q since Luke has interpolated a verse (12^{52}) and has not given the Micah quotation (7^{6}) echoed in Matthew. What I wish to suggest here is this: that, despite a superficial similarity, the thought of the two passages is strikingly different; [2] that commentators, partly under the influence of the Q hypothesis itself and partly because of the obvious similarities, have failed to emphasize this difference; and that this difference must be explained in some way other than that suggested by Farrer's hypothesis of Luke knowing and using Matthew.

An examination of the Matthean verses shows that the form of 10^{34} differs from that of Lk 12^{51}, and resembles Mt 5^{17} which in turn echoes the conventions of Rabbinic disputations.[3] There are also differences in word order between the two verses, and in vocabulary, the use of μάχαιρα where Luke uses διαμερισμός. Verses 35 and 36 echo Mic 7^{6}, although only *v.* 36 resembles a direct quotation.

The use of διχάσαι by Matthew in *v.* 35 is notable for the word occurs only here in the N.T. and is not found in the LXX. The word is rarely used in classical Greek; where it does occur its meaning is frequently metaphorical, for example, dividing the parts of a syllogism. Both A.V. and R.V. by reading, 'to set at variance,' have given its metaphorical meaning, *i.e.* to disunite, in the sense of 'to make to disagree.' It also appears twice in Aquila's translation of the O.T. in Lv 1^{17} and Dt 14^{6} where the context in both cases concerns division or separation in the physical and not metaphorical sense. The intriguing problem at this point is whether the Evangelist was using the verb in its literal or, as the A.V. and R.V. imply, in its metaphorical sense. There is no evidence which directly bears on the problem. The solution, if one is at all possible, must come from a consideration of factors which are indirectly relevant to the problem. The first of these is that if here διαχάσαι is translated metaphorically, then it would seem, as some commentators in fact suggest, that the reference to the sword in *v.* 34 must also be taken metaphorically, for the sword is not a weapon which creates, but ends, dissension in the sense of disagreement and quarrelling. On the other hand, the Micah quotation, echoed but not cited verbatim here, appears in the Mishnah, where Sotah (9^{15}) presents a picture of violence and destruction at the coming of Messiah. 'Galilee shall be laid waste, and Gablan shall be made desolate, and the people of the frontier shall go from city to city with none to show pity on them.' The passage ends with a quotation from Mic 7^{6}. Moreover the Rabbinic conception of physical violence accompanying the coming of Messiah is also found in the late apocalyptic writings; for example, Manson [4] cites Jubilees $23^{16.\ 19}$—'and in that generation the sons will convict their fathers and their elders of sin and unrighteousness. . . . And they will strive one with another, the young with the old, and the old with the young.' Another example is 4 Ezra 6^{24}—'And at that time, friends shall war against friends like enemies,' a clause which Charles [5] assigns to an earlier ch. 4 describing the signs preceding the End.

To sum up: in Mt 10^{34-36} it is possible that by his use of μάχαιρα, and of διχάζω (the latter, following the use of μάχαιρα, in the sense of 'to cut apart,' divide violently) and in the light of the Rabbinic background elsewhere betrayed by him, Matthew has developed (or there was developed in the circle from which he wrote) a dominical saying about 'not bringing peace but . . .' in the light of Rabbinical eschatological traditions of the expectation of violence accompanying the coming of Messiah.

Turning to the Lucan verses, it is important to note that *v.* 51 should not be considered in isolation from *vv.* 49, 50 as with those commentators who see in *v.* 51 merely an edited version of Mt 10^{34}. Following Burney, where *vv.* 49–51 are quoted as

[1] *E.g.*, McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 147; Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 179; Kilpatrick, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 17; *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. Sanday, 250; Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 121; Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew*, 56, where he contends that Luke is based on Matthew, thus eliminating the need for the Q hypothesis.

[2] Cf. Allen, *St. Matthew* [*I.C.C.*], 110 on Mt 10^{34} and Lk 12^{51}: 'But context and phraseology are alike different. The Evangelists draw from different sources.'

[3] Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 63.

[4] *The Sayings of Jesus*, 121.

[5] *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 576.

an example of Synthetic Parallelism,[1] and his reference to Mt 10^{34} as an example of step-parallelism where Luke's reading in *v.* 51 illustrates Luke's way of removing Semitic redundancy,[2] the Aramaic basis of Lk 12^{49-51} might be reconstructed as follows :

I came to cast fire upon the earth ;
And what will I, if it be already kindled ?
But I have a baptism wherewith to be baptized
And how am I straitened till it be accomplished !
Think ye that I came to give peace on the earth ?
I came not to bring peace, but rather (division)

Two further points may be noted about this verse. Black has noted the Aramaisms in this verse which do not appear in the corresponding Mt 10^{34}.[3] Secondly, Luke's use of *διαμερισμός* and not *μάχαιρα* as in Matthew. The word means division, in the sense of dissension, *i.e.*, the opposite to 'peace' in the sense of concord, agreement, between persons. Verse 52 develops the startling idea that His coming creates 'division.' The kind of division is 'three against two and two against three.' Manson states this is a division between generations, 'it is the new generation against the old.'[4] But it is equally a division of the old against the young,[5] as becomes clear in the further logical expansion and elaboration in *v.* 53 where the line of division runs thus :

father against son, and son against father
mother against daughter and daughter against mother
mother in law against bride and bride against mother in law.

There are thus important differences between these verses and those of Mt 10^{34-36}. First, the Aramaisms reflected in *v.* 51 do not appear in Mt 10^{34}. Moreover, following Burney, *v.* 51 is inseparable from the two preceding verses which are absent from Matthew. Secondly in Luke, the dissension created by the Lord's coming is a two-way traffic, and not the case of the younger against the older as in Matthew. More important, it is dissension between persons, particularly persons of the same family, the most poisoning and embittering form of dissension that can arise between private individuals ; to such, Matthew's reference to the 'sword' is alien and altogether in a different key. Thirdly, *vv.* 52 and 53 are a logical expansion on the theme of dissension ; this expansion betrays no dependence on Matthew, and in view of the absence of Aramaisms may be the work of the author himself.

Finally, what general conclusions can be drawn from this examination ? First, it is clear that the differences between the two passages are sufficiently marked to force a rejection of the explanation of their superficial similarity by the hypothesis that Luke knew and used the Matthean verses. Secondly, if Lk 12^{49-51} is not derived from a source used independently by Matthew and Luke, the similarity between the two passages may be explained on the assumption that, in respect of these sayings, Matthew and Luke inherited traditions which shared a common starting-point, but which developed independently in oral tradition to produce passages which on close examination are not very similar. Thirdly, there is a possibility that the Matthean tradition developed in oral tradition under the influence of Rabbinic expectations that the coming of the End would be heralded by violence and destruction. Fourthly, it is impossible on the basis of this examination alone to decide whether some of these verses originally existed in Q ; it is possible only to suggest that on the basis of the presence of Aramaisms in one and their absence in the other, the priority would seem to lie with the Lucan version, at least of *vv.* 49–51. This does not necessarily imply that they are dominical. It does imply, negatively, the improbability of a dominical origin of Mt 10^{34}—'Think not that I came to send peace on the earth ; I came not to send peace, but a sword.'

T. A. Roberts

Keele, Staffs

[1] *The Poetry of our Lord*, 90.
[2] *Ib.* 92.
[3] *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 40.
[4] *Op. cit.*, 121.
[5] Cf. Creed, *op. cit.*, 179 : 'In Micah and Matthew, it is the younger generation which rises against the older. But in Luke the hostility is represented as mutual.'

Mobs and Men

By the Very Reverend S. Barton Babbage, Ph.D., Th.D., Dean of Melbourne, Australia

Soren Kierkegaard was never tired of proclaiming that 'the crowd is untruth.'[1] In the crowd, he says, a man becomes 'impenitent and irresponsible'; he becomes capable of any devilry, of any brutality. Rabble rousers know this elementary fact. All that is required, Kierkegaard says, is 'some talent, a certain dose of falsehood, and a little acquaintance with human passions,' The rest is easy.

It is worth exploring, in more detail, the psychology of the crowd. Why do men—civilized men—become frenzied victims of hysteria? Why do men surrender themselves to the passions of the mob? Why do men seek to lose themselves in a crowd?

Aldous Huxley thinks that the appeal of the crowd is basically orgiastic and dionysiac. The experience of being absorbed in a crowd, he says, is remarkably akin to alcoholic intoxication. There is the same sense of emotional release, of reckless abandon, of eager escape. 'Most human beings,' according to Huxley, 'feel a craving to escape from the cramping limitations of their ego, to take periodical holidays from their all too familiar, all too squalid little self.'[2] And this escape is most simply and easily achieved in the blessed anonymity of the crowd.

In this fact lies some of the appeal of mass sports. They are a characteristic feature of twentieth-century life. Lewis Mumford regards mass sports as a symbol of a decaying civilization. 'Sport, in the sense of a mass spectacle, with death to add to the underlying excitement, comes into existence when a population has been drilled and regimented and depressed to such an extent that it needs at least a vicarious participation in difficult feats of skill or heroism to sustain its waning life-sense.'[3] Whether or not this be so, it is an incontrovertible fact that mass sports are one of the most potent and popular avenues for the release of emotional tension. The thrill of the spectacle is intensified by the promise of immediate death or fatal injury.

The cry of horror that escapes from the crowd when the motor car overturns or the airplane crashes is not one of surprise but of fulfilled expectations; is it not fundamentally for the sake of exciting just such bloodlust that the competition itself is held and widely attended? By means of the talking picture that spectacle and that thrill are repeated in a thousand theatres throughout the world as a mere incident in the presentation of the week's news; so that a steady habituation to blood-letting and exhibitionistic murder and suicide accompanies the spread of the machine and, becoming stale by the repetition in its milder forms, encourages the demand for more massive and desperate exhibitions of brutality.[4]

As one of the crowd, the spectator shares in these exploits and exhibitions by a simple process of projection. He becomes 'at one with a primitive undifferentiated group.'

His muscles contract or relax with the progress of the game, his breath comes quick or slow, his shouts heighten the excitement of the moment and increase his internal sense of the drama; in moments of frenzy he pounds his neighbour's back or embraces him.

All this is a matter of common observation.

The dictators have skilfully exploited this emotional frustration of modern man for their own diabolical and sadistic purposes. By organizing mammoth rallies they have excited and fomented the animal passions of hate and fear. They know that in the company of a crowd a man loses himself; he forgets the kind of man he aspires to be; he surrenders himself to what Huxley describes as 'the darkness of sub-human emotionalism and panic animality.'[5] He is no longer a rational and responsible being; he is only a demagogue's dupe.

Again and again the inhibitions of men have been released and their emotions aroused by the cunning artifices of wicked men. An illustration may be taken from the events of the Crucifixion.

On Palm Sunday Jesus was joyfully acclaimed by the crowd as the Messiah: with palm branches and hosannas He was brought in triumph to Jerusalem. And yet five days later that same crowd, at the instigation of the Jewish leaders, was howling for His blood. It is always the fickle crowd which, in its blind ignorance, shouts: 'Crucify Him! Crucify Him!' Such is the cruel irresponsibility, the basic irrationality, of the crowd.

That is why Jesus never sought to win men in the mass. He knew the weakness of men: their vulnerability and gullibility. He would not assault their minds nor weaken their wills by skilful demagogy and brutal battery: by the emotional

[1] *The Point of View* (Eng. tr., 1939], 114.
[2] *Ends and Means* [1938], 72.
[3] *Technics and Civilization* [1947], 303.
[4] *Ib.*, 304 f.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 72.

exploitation of their hopes and fears, their hates and loves. He was acutely aware of the danger: 'Jesus, perceiving that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him king, withdrew again into the mountain himself alone.' [1] That is why He addressed to men not a general call but a personal invitation: 'Come, follow Me.'

> There is no expeditious road
> To pack and label men for God,
> And save them by the barrel-load.[2]

Of course not. There is only the personal invitation addressed, not to the many, but to the one: and the Divine declaration: 'I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine.' [3]

It was for this same reason that Jesus formed His followers into a society and called them into the fellowship of a church. There is all the difference in the world between a crowd and a community. A crowd necessarily involves the obliteration of personality by its submersion in the mass; a community, however, leads to the realization of personality by the creation of fellowship. In the one case there is the denial of personality; in the other case, respect for personality. In the one case there is only the achievement of an undifferentiated animality; in the other case there is the achievement of a rich variety. And the basis of this fellowship is not the mere fact of physical propinquity: it is not the consequence of fortuitous aggregation: on the contrary, it is the product of a shared redemption and a common forgiveness. And the result is, that it is not a brittle and fragile thing, but an enduring reality.

And into this saving fellowship may God in His mercy bring us all!

[1] Jn 6^{15}.

[2] Francis Thompson, *Epilogue to 'A Judgment in Heaven.'*

[3] Is 43^{1}.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque [1]

Dressing-Up

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Be clothed with humility.'—1 P 5^{5}

'Take unto you the whole armour of God.'—Eph 6^{13}.

You can often see on Saturday mornings in the streets of Liverpool a quaint little procession of half a dozen youngsters, not more than six or seven years old. They sport the most grotesque rigs—remnants of mother's wedding dress trailing in the mud, father's cast-off bowler hat, a football jersey or two, a woe-begone parasol (ideal for a winter's day!), and a liberal helping of elder sister's lipstick. Add a collecting box, and you have the whole outfit.

Dressing-up is huge fun. Children have been doing it in one way and another ever since Jesus told the people of His day that they were like a lot of children who didn't know whether they wanted to play at weddings or funerals.

These children in Liverpool gutters are dressing-up to make themselves out to be something that they really are not. It is much more important sometimes to dress up to show what you really are. If you belong to a Scout troop, your uniform ought to indicate some one who is ready to do a good turn to any one. If you wear your school cap, it ought to show that you honour the school traditions. If a man faints at the football match, what do you look for? The black and white uniform of the St. John's Ambulance Brigade, of course.

Churchill records (in *Their Finest Hour*) something which may become a titbit of English history, parallel with Alfred's burning of the cakes and Drake's game of bowls. Amidst complex instructions for battleships going to war, orders for the movement of mighty armies, and plans to keep Britain's sea arteries open when we were quite alone in the grimmest days of the War, there stands a note from the Prime Minister to the First Lord of the Admiralty: 'Surely you can run to a new Admiralty flag. It grieves me to see the present dingy object every morning.' How right he was! Britain needed just then to gain all the courage she could from the symbols which had long meant so much.

Think how often the Bible talks about dressing-up—and not always in the best sense. There was Gehazi, Elisha's servant, who showed his treachery to his master by going after Naaman and taking changes of raiment from him. There was the man in the parable St. Matthew records who, having come to a wedding feast, was churlish enough to refuse to wear the ceremonial robe which the host always supplied in the East. 'He got what was coming to him' is a very ugly current phrase, but it sums up Mt 22^{13} pretty shrewdly. There was David, who first dressed up in Saul's armour, but made it quite clear that his faith in God was a much greater defence against Goliath than any coat of mail.

[1] Because of space difficulties this month one children's sermon has been omitted.—*Editor.*

But there are other places as well as these. When the callous priests had told their lies, and Pilate had washed his useless hands, and the bawling crowds had yelled, 'His blood be upon us,' and the cruel lictors had flogged Him, Jesus fell into the hands of the Roman soldiers. They dressed Him up. They kneeled and mocked and spat: 'Hail, King of the Jews!' They thought that their scarlet robe and thorn crown and mock sceptre would make Him look more foolish than bridal clothes make street children. But they were wrong.

Once that same Jesus had taken a slave's towel, poured water into a basin, and washed His friends' feet. Even with that disguise, He looked every inch a King. Peter never forgot, and years afterwards he bade young Christians 'be clothed with humility': let that be your uniform.

When Paul, languishing in a Roman gaol, was worrying his heart out about his infant Church in Ephesus, he caught sight of the dapper Roman soldier to whom he was manacled. There he stood, with two short swords at his waist, his pike in his hand, his shield on his left arm, his cuirass shining in the gloom of the prison, his shins guarded with metal greaves, his plumed helmet on his head, massively ready for any emergency. Of course, that was how Paul's Christian soldiers must be. So he wrote to them: 'Put on the whole armour of God.'

The man who can wear that, and wear it humbly, is in full dress uniform. There is all the difference in the world between being properly dressed and being dressed-up.

The Christian Year[1]

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Deeds Not Words

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D., GLASGOW

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'—Mt 7^{21}.

In popular estimation the highest praise which can be given to a minister is to say of him 'He has filled the church.' To get as many people as possible to pray, to worship and to join in the activities of a congregation is assumed to be the main, if not the only, function of the ministry. And, of course, a packed church in these days is proof that the minister of it is at least reasonably industrious, and something of a personality in addition. Yet, if there is anything clear from our text and from the whole of Christ's teaching and from His life, it is that He had no use at all for religion considered as an end in itself. It was not religion He came to bring to men. It was life. 'I am come,' He said, 'that they might have life.' Archbishop Temple was quite right when he remarked that there is no reason to suppose that God is only or even mainly interested in religion. Jesus could say terrible things at times and did. He could compare men to whited sepulchres and filthy vessels, could plainly call them 'hypocrites.' Of whom did He speak thus? Of non-church-going profligates? No, indeed! Those whom He so described were those who were never away from the Temple—the priests and scribes and Pharisees.

In the chapter from which the text comes, our Lord is giving an account of the Last Judgment. He says that in that day many will say 'Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?' Christ, be it noted, doesn't doubt this. Those who made the claim may well have done all that they claimed to do—preached and cast out devils and done many wonderful works. Christ doesn't deny that, but He does deny them. 'Depart from me, ye that work iniquity.' St. Paul was quite correctly interpreting his Master's words when in his hymn of love in First Corinthians he said, 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.' As we might paraphrase this and the succeeding verse, 'Though I am the best preacher in the world, I am nothing but a noise without love. Though I am the best scholar and theologian there has ever been and have no love in my heart, I am nothing.' All of which is commentary on how dreadfully easy it is to take the name of Christ to ourselves, how easy to try and save ourselves by saying something—how easy to try, how impossible to succeed. For, of course, we are dealing with God. It is easy to take in the world by a profession of Christianity. It is not too hard to take in even those who know us well. It is even possible to take in ourselves. It is utterly impossible to take in God. He is not nearly so interested in our religious profession or in our piety as in our daily practice.

1. So, quite simply, the text warns us against words without deeds. There is something admirable about the old lady who resolutely closed her lips when she came to the words of the hymn

> Take my silver and my gold;
> Not a mite would I withhold.

She had every intention of withholding most of her silver and her gold, and did not propose to make

[1] A series of studies on lesser known parables begins this month. The first study will be found at the Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

the situation worse by lying about it. If only a recording were taken of the things we say and sing in church to be played over to us at intervals during the week, would not we blush with shame? That is what keeps many decent folk out of the Church—the unreality of so many of our prayers and hymns, the contrast between what we say and sing and what we do and are. Let us watch how we behave and behave as we say, for the eyes of the world are upon us. Remember that our Lord's last words to those whose deeds plainly conflict with their lives is 'Depart.' 'Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the will of My Father shall enter the kingdom.'

2. The text may be taken, too, to warn against feeling without deeds, against a false emotionalism. Not one 'Lord' contented the claimants to the Kingdom. 'Lord, Lord,' they had cried, and their excitement was understandable. It is not every day that prophecy is heard in the church or that devils are cast forth or wonderful works performed. They had had their share of these profound religious experiences. No wonder they felt that they were entitled to heaven. It is so easy to feel deeply—so much easier than to do much or to give much. Tolstoi tells of a Russian lady at a moving play who left the theatre with tears of compassion streaming down her cheeks to find her driver frozen to death in the bitter cold.

It is a good rule of the spiritual life to allow no feeling to pass without doing something about it. If a sermon or some great music moves you deeply, it is spiritual wisdom to do something extra and to do it at once. It is dangerous to cut the nerve between emotion and action. That, finally, leads to the pursuit of feeling for its own sake, the will becomes soft and flabby, the conscience dulled, and we wallow in the morass of our own selfish sentimentality. 'What have I *done*—not thought or felt or said, but what have I done to-day for the sake of Christ?' is the question we should ask ourselves each night, remembering that 'Not every one that saith Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the will of the Father shall enter the kingdom of heaven.'

3. But, lastly, notice precisely what the text says, 'Not *every one* that saith "Lord, Lord."' That surely means that some who say 'Lord, Lord' shall be excluded from heaven, but some who say 'Lord, Lord' will be admitted. The text no more encourages works divorced from faith than faith divorced from works. Not those who only say, nor those who only do, but those who say *and* do are welcomed by Christ. Not those who only pray, nor those who only labour, but those whose prayers issue in labour and whose labour is inspired and directed by prayer are of the highest service to God. If we are to have strength and grace to do the works of Christ each day we shall take time to call on His name each morning. If we spend our days genuinely trying to serve God in such a world as ours, it will drive us to our knees again by evening, and often we shall have done nothing that we can point to with any pride. Our only hope will be if God hears the prayer, 'Lord, be merciful to me a sinner.'

And He does. The Lord is wonderfully gracious. There was that soul who had heeded not at all the will of the Father in life and who had passed quite beyond the possibility of doing aught for Him. When he, with blackened lips and thickened tongue, could say little else but 'Lord, Lord' his prayer was heard and answered with the promise of Paradise by evening time. A life-time of disservice to God and man, a prayer and then bliss for ever! To our eyes there is no sense in it, but with God all things are possible. That is precisely why we dare not, must not, presume on His mercy. Though our failures in service are made up by Him who came as the servant of all, and although the death on Calvary covers all that is lacking in our righteousness, we shall not surely neglect to do anything we can do which is pleasing to God, we who have with any kind of sincerity cried, 'Lord, Lord.' Our prayer at the end of each hour of worship will be

Guard Thou the lips from sin, the hearts from shame,
That in this house have called upon Thy Name.

We will not presume upon the goodness of God if we remember that 'Not *every one* that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.'

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Laughing at Sin

BY THE REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, D.D.,
HIGHBRIDGE, SOMERSET

'Fools make a mock at sin.'—Pr 14^9.

There is a good deal about fools and their ways in the Proverbs. What sort of people were they? What were their distinguishing marks? They were neither imbecile nor insane. One could scarcely even call them mentally deficient. Yet they were deficient in something. What was it?

What do we mean when we say that any one is a fool? Not usually that he is uneducated or ignorant. A fool may know plenty of things, be able to pass examinations and get university degrees, but he uses his knowledge awkwardly, shows incompetence and want of tact in practical matters. A fool, both in Old Testament times and

in our own day, is the opposite of a wise man. But nowadays we talk a good deal more about fools than about wise men. Perhaps that is because there are more of them about. The words *wise* and *wisdom* have come to sound rather priggish, and we prefer to talk about scientists, experts, the smart, the brainy. Yet a man may be one or all of these and still be a fool. The fact that a fool is a scientist or an expert will simply give his folly a wider range, and a fool who is smart or brainy will be able to impose upon a larger number of people.

The wise man of the Old Testament had the practical knowledge required for the right ordering of his life. The fool's knowledge never sits gracefully on him. The wise man's does. There is a sense of proportion regarding the importance of one piece of knowledge compared with another. The wise man does not use his knowledge for his own glorification and self-satisfaction, and he is not too eager to use it for putting other people in the wrong.

The wise man, above all, does not regard religious knowledge as a special kind of hobby for those whose tastes run that way. There are plenty of clever people who leave God out of account, but they get their knowledge out of focus. Knowledge about this world that God made will be very one-sided if God who made the world is forgotten. And when it comes to knowledge about the men and women whom God has created to be His fellow-workers, that simply will not make sense if it ignores the purpose for which God made them. What would we think of the knowledge of a railway engine and its workings that took no account of the fact that a railway engine is built in order to pull a train ?

But the fool hath said in his heart, ' there is no God.' That might mean that after thinking things out the fool had come to the conclusion that there was no God, but that as he lived in a society that believed in God he deemed it safer to keep such dangerous thoughts to himself. There may have been some people like that in Jerusalem when the Psalms and the Proverbs were written, but it is unlikely that the majority of fools had thought things out so thoroughly. Fools are not fond of thinking things out. No, but the fool thinks, plans, talks, acts as if there were no God. That is practical godlessness.

If we look around us to-day we can see much the same thing. There are plenty of godless people. They are not people who have thought things out and come to the conclusion that there is no God. Many of them would indignantly deny that they were atheists in that sense. Nevertheless they think, plan, speak, and act as though there were no God. They leave God out of their lives. God has no place in their heart, that is in their loving, their desiring, their aspirations. And therefore they are fools.

Our text takes note of one particular symptom of folly, namely, that fools make a mock of sin. But if sin is wrong why should it not be a matter for mockery and contempt ? But that is not what is meant. The point is that because fools leave God out of account they have no use for the idea of sin and so they laugh at it. They dismiss it as an old-fashioned notion. Why ? Because you cannot think of sin without thinking at the same time of God in the background. Therefore if you want to forget about God you must do your best to forget about sin too. But sin will not allow you to forget about it. There it is, throwing grit into the machinery of life all the time. What are we going to do about it ? Call it by some other name, says the fool. But other words, such as *crime, delinquency, offence* are not the exact equivalents of sin. They do not remind us of God. We cannot get rid of the thing itself, but let us at least drop the word, says the fool, the religious word that reminds us that God made us, that God keeps us in life, that God will one day judge us, that, indeed, He is judging us now.

That is one way of mocking at sin. There are others. You may make jokes about it, and after all if you are on joking terms with anything it cannot be so terrible. How much bad language arises out of this mocking at sin ! There is a certain kind of bad language which, though not expressly taking God's name in vain, by the light use of such words as *hell, damn, devil* makes it difficult to take seriously God's purpose for man in redeeming him from the power of sin and offering him the gift of eternal life.

You can hardly mock at sin without mocking at God too. And there are other ways of mocking at sin than making jokes about it. Those who might think that joking about sin was in bad taste mock at it by finding better-sounding names for it, names that do not trouble the conscience, names that have a more scientific ring about them, names that make us forget our responsibility for sin and the certainty that we shall have to give account for our sins. So we speak of the survival of primitive instincts, failure to react to environment, maladjustment to social conditions, complexes, and so on.

It is the Bible that shows us sin as it really is, above all an offence against God, a refusal to co-operate with Him in the plan that He has for those whom He has made a little lower than the angels and bearing His own image. If that were all, we might learn from the Bible only more about our misery. But that is not all, for in the Bible we learn that if we confess our sins God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness, and that if we sin we

have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

True Security

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, D.D., EDINBURGH

'I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved. . . .' [Phillips—'safe and sound'].—Jn 10^9.

The great search of our time is the search for security. Not greed of gain, not the tedious, endless business of 'keeping up with the Joneses,' but, deep down, the desire for security keeps men and women going. What frenzied efforts we make to insure against the risks of life, and how futile it sometimes seems! So often the whole security of a home hangs on the one slender thread of the health and wage-earning capacity of the bread-winner. The heart cries out for some security that will go deeper, be firmer founded, more truly secure. Here Christ offers His own picture of security. It is not a super air-raid shelter. It is a sheepfold on a bare hillside, a circular stout wall, high, and narrowing toward the top, with a sort of *chevaux de frise* of sharp thorns on top to prevent any wild beast from climbing over. There is only one break in the wall, a little doorway only the height of a sheep, and when the flock are safely inside the shepherd lies down across the doorway and becomes himself the door. Here is a great claim, a rare offer of real security. Is it true that in Christ, as in no one else, we can be safe and sound?

Christ offers us *the security of truth within which the mind can rest.* It was He who said: 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.' Free—from what? From fear? The Welfare State has freed us in Britain from three ancient fears—the fear of ill-health, of unemployment, and of an unprovided old age. It has left strangely untouched this deeper sense of insecurity. So many people are in the position of the pilots of fighter aircraft that took off from the deck of the carrier to protect one of the Russian convoys, and as they got near the end of their flying time kept searching for those few yards of solid deck amid the waste of waters and calling out over the radio: 'For God's sake give me a fix, I can't find the carrier.' In the same way our hearts and minds cry out for just enough solid truth on which to land and wherein to rest.

> To one fixed ground my spirit clings:
> I know that God is good.

Christ gives us the truth about this fantastic universe in which we live. It is good for us to stop in this 'satellite' age and realize that the distance man's technological skill has penetrated into outer space is on the scale of the universe less than the height of the Scott Monument in Princes Street, Edinburgh, in comparison with the peak of Everest. It is sheer human presumption to look on this glittering, ordered immensity, and regard it just as a vast machine-shop where some one may at any moment throw a spanner in the works. It is most salutary to ask what meaning or message, if any, is at the heart of it all. When we listen, do we hear the now familiar signals: 'Bleep, bleep, bleep,' and is that all? Christ bids us look at our world, all the way from sparrows to stars, and see a Father's power and wisdom at work. He bids us listen and hear a message that carries a meaning,

> For ever singing, as they shine,
> 'The hand that made us is divine.'

What is more, Christ alone gives us a true estimate of our place within this vastness. The whole story of His life is witness to the fact that more of God has been revealed in one true human personality than in all the stars and suns of space. He lifts up human nature, so much decried and degraded, and gives back to it dignity and worth and a new status. Further, Christ tells men the truth about the destiny of this world and of our human life. What is it making for? Behind us lies a long story of painful struggle upwards to finer things and better ways of life. Is it all to end in one searing, blinding flash of total destruction? Amid all the discussion about summit talks the heart longs for some clear and unequivocal declaration of policy 'from the top.' In Christ we have been given exactly that: 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.' God may have other words for other worlds than this, but for this world His Word is still Christ.

Christ offers *the security of facts which faith can grasp.* In the old idea of sanctuary a fugitive would run and take hold of the horns of the altar, or stand within the ring of sanctuary stones—there was always something you could grasp, somewhere you could take your stand, and know you were safe and sound. Christ stands for that and offers that. His birth and death and rising again are offered not as theories, but as realities on which faith can lay hold, facts on which it may take its stand. God loved, God gave, God sent—there are the horns of the altar, the sanctuary stones where security can be found. When a man's faith truly lays hold on the Cross, what strong convictions follow. Here is the answer to the crucial question: 'Who claims the world?' A rather odd American was very annoyed when the Russians invaded outer space, for he had claimed it already and dubbed it 'Celestia!' When it was planned to use the Outer Hebrides as rocket ranges Britain sent a Naval party out to Rockall, that plug of rock rising

out of the Atlantic. They landed by helicopter, let a bronze plate into the rock, set up a flagstaff, and ran up the Union Jack, annexing Rockall to Britain. The Cross is like God's flag-pole set up on this earth, the symbol of His annexation of human history, the expression of His claim on the world. This can never be Communism's world or Democracy's world, but always and only God's world, because of the Cross. Here is our only guarantee of God's continuing concern. How do we know that God has not abandoned the world to its well-deserved fate, that our situation is not that of the survivors of the sailing ship *Pamir*, drifting helplessly, making cries that no one hears, signalling frantically, but there is no one to see? In the words of Dr. John White, that great leader of the Church in Scotland: 'God has put too much of Himself into the world to desert it now.' Look, above all, at the Cross in the light of the Resurrection, without which it carries only a message of despair, and you find your only assurance that the last word is not with human sin and evil, ignorance, prejudice and blind hatred, but with the love of God.

Christ offers *the security of a relationship which nothing can break*. In that lies the deepest security of all. When one listens to the words of Henley's *Invictus*, and remembers they were written when he had his leg amputated without an anæsthetic, they seem the ultimate expression of the security a man finds, deep down within himself, in his own unconquerable spirit:

Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods may be
For my unconquerable soul.
. . . . . .
It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate:
I am the captain of my soul.

What could be finer than that? Where could there be deeper security than in this last-ditch defiance of the human spirit? Listen to another man, sorely tried. 'For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, . . . nor things present, nor things to come . . . shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.' Here, surely, is a deeper note, a truer security. Most modern congregations merely feel awkward and self-conscious if a preacher of the 'evangelistic' school ends his address with a pointed, personal appeal: 'Are you saved?' Might that old appeal not be re-worded and re-applied to all who seek after real security: 'Have you entered through Christ into a relationship with God which nothing can break? Then you are saved, you are safe and sound.'

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Parable of the Patch

BY THE REVEREND W. B. J. MARTIN, AUGUSTINE-BRISTO CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, EDINBURGH

'No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old; if otherwise, then both the new maketh a rent, and the piece that was taken out of the new agreeth not with the old.'—Lk 5^{36}.

We miss the point of this Parable if we fail to notice that the 'new garment' referred to here is not the teaching of Jesus, but the teaching and practice of the Pharisees.

When C. H. Dodd, commenting on this verse, says: 'The ministry of Jesus is not to be regarded as an attempt to reform Judaism; it brings something entirely new, which cannot be accommodated to the traditional system' (*The Parables of the Kingdom*, 117), he is saying something obviously true, but is it the point of this particular Parable? The contrast here is not between Judaism and Christianity, but between life and system. The 'new garment' is the practice of fasting and prayer enjoined by Judaism. This was 'new,' not in the sense of being novel, but in the sense of being alien, strange, and unfamiliar to the followers of Jesus. To sew pieces of this stiff, untried material upon the lives of people like Levi the publican would, according to Jesus, have two unfortunate results: it would inevitably 'rend' their old lives, tear them apart, make them more ragged than ever; and it would succeed in making them look ridiculous.

The concern of Jesus was for the integrity and dignity of the human person; any attempt to patch life up with material that was alien to it was to be resisted.

The Parable cannot be a warning against adding Christianity to Judaism, for the followers of Jesus were not Judaists. They were 'publicans and sinners,' moral, spiritual and social outcasts, ostracized by their fellow-countrymen. But Jesus had awakened their dormant spiritual life, and had rescued them from isolation by drawing them into a community centred upon Himself. At this point, the Pharisees, who had previously ignored them and given them up as hopeless, suddenly began to take an interest in them. Partly in defence of their cherished system, partly out of genuine concern for the welfare of these new converts, they now began to question the wisdom of Jesus in failing to root their lives in the tried and tested tradition of the national religion, which could be such a help to them. It was in answer to this line of argument that Jesus said: 'No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old.'

When we read the Parable in this way it becomes immediately relevant to modern life. The twentieth-century counterpart of the publicans and

sinners are non-church-goers, not converts from another faith who are tempted to add pieces of the Christian garment to their previous religion. When such men are brought to a knowledge of Christ, we are sometimes tempted to hedge their lives around with 'safeguards,' or to foist upon them the habits and practices we have found useful for ourselves. Abbé Godin gives a striking instance of this in his book *France Pagan?* 'Jean was an anarchist; on his chest were tattooed the words, "No God, no boss." He was wounded during the Clichy riots of 1937, where he did some shooting himself. He was converted—without difficulty—for he had a generous nature in need of an ideal. Christ fulfilled that need, Christ became his ideal, the Divine Personality of our Saviour carried him off his feet. I prepared him for his first communion; he read the Gospel; chosen passages from St. Paul were explained to him. He was all but ready when I was called away. A nun undertook to finish the instructions, but on my return I found everything broken off. I could not understand it. Jean was heroically generous, ready for every sacrifice that Christ's love might ask of him. What could have happened? I asked him. Yes, of course, he still loved our Lord; he would die for Him . . . but what Jean cannot stand is a whole lot of prohibitions, a sort of "police code" which it seems to him has no connexion with the love of Christ.'

The pattern of Christian life must be true both to the warmth and generosity of the gospel, and to the nature of the man who is converted. Disciplines and practices imposed from without, however venerable, might only rend the life, *i.e.*, create conflicts and tensions where none need exist. The verb 'rend' is *schizo*, from whence comes our word 'schizophrenia'—split personality. Christ came to unify life, but sometimes what we add to His gospel—our emphasis on 'respectability,' on middle-class habits of speech and dress, on restraint and 'safety first'—only succeeds in wrenching people from their old environment and from their friends and families. Sometimes a good pagan becomes a spoiled human being by being thus uprooted. I have seen this happen again and again to working-class boys and girls, who have become fearful prigs, and have lost touch with the environment wherein they might have been potential evangelists.

The teaching of this Parable has a threefold relevance.

1. It is relevant to evangelism. An evangelizing church must make sure that it is seeking to win men for Christ, and not for some cherished pattern of church life. I take this comment almost at random from a recent report. 'The most interesting aspect of the mission was the impression made upon some of the most difficult "teddy-boy" and "rock 'n roll" groups. Some made decisions, but the greatest difficulty arose when it came to integrating them with the type of youngster in the church-fellowship. There was no hostility, but simply a great gulf of baffled bewilderment on the part of the church young people, and an awkward ill-at-ease restlessness on the part of the newcomers that could not be overcome. We have lost—apparently—all these contacts.' Well might Tom Allen ask in *The Face of My Parish*: 'What is the point of evangelism if we are incapable of assimilating the convert?' If our churches were concerned with the integrity of the convert and with encouraging him to express his new-found experience in a manner appropriate to him, rather than fitting him in to an established pattern, the vitality of both church and convert would be immensely quickened.

2. It is relevant to prayer and worship. 'Fasting' and 'prayers' were 'new garments' to the converts of Jesus. In due course they would perhaps feel the need for them, but that time was not yet. Forms of the devotional life appropriate to men who were integrated into the Jewish community were hardly suitable for men who had long been ostracized and had now discovered a more intimate kind of community life. We are dealing to-day with people who find it difficult to secure privacy, who are unaccustomed to silence. Is it reasonable to saddle them with a practice of prayer that has grown out of the monastic cell or the country house? I remember a fine east-end boy, lately won to Christ, telling me, with a hint of self-accusation, that while he took part in public prayer meetings and got a great deal of help from them, he found it almost impossible to say his prayers in private. He blamed himself for this, but why should he? He had discovered that he was a more real and genuine person when he was in company than when he was alone, as indeed most of us are. Every man must find his own way to God, and surely the important thing is not how we pray, but how we become real and open enough for God to get at us.

3. The new converts of Jesus were the astonished recipients of a gospel, good news, and their lives were full of joy. To practise fasting in such circumstances would have been to distort their experience. There is a place for fasting—'when the bridegroom is taken away.' But the first concern of the Christian is to appropriate the Good News, to throw his life open to the power and fullness of the gospel. This certainly demands discipline, but not the discipline taken from another system. The discipline incumbent upon the Christian is to make his life accessible to God—so to live and work and play and enter into personal relations, so to use leisure and home and domestic life, that he thereby gives God the greatest possible opportunity of entering into his life and filling it.

The Order for the Lord's Supper of the Church of South India

By the Reverend J. R. Macphail, M.A., D.D., Madras Christian College, Tambaram, South India

I

During the negotiations for the Union which produced the Church of South India, there was a proposal to draw up an order for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, but the proposal was quickly dropped. The members of the Negotiating Committee felt that people would be able to appreciate unfamiliar forms of worship after union better than before. And they were right. After union we began to consider our various heritages in a new way, eager to seek out and to bring into the new house anything in the old houses that could be used. Bishop Hollis has said that the difference between wanting to be united and being united is like the difference between an engagement and a marriage.

The beautiful orders of service drawn up by the Negotiating Committee for use at the Inauguration must have made some people think, but at first there was no talk of new forms of worship for ordinary use. The Church was inaugurated in September 1947. In March 1948 the Synod, the supreme court, met for five days at Madurai. There was only one Communion Service, conducted by Bishop Newbigin, and he followed one of the forms (so far as he can remember, the first) in *The Book of Common Order* of the Church of Scotland. The service was found to be good, and indeed many presbyters of all traditions used it in the following years. Yet there was the feeling that some of those present were hosts, while the others were guests. However, though the Synod appointed a Liturgy Committee, with Leslie Brown as Convener, they gave it nothing to do. Almost a year later, in February 1949, the Executive Committee instructed the Liturgy Committee to draft a Confirmation Service (the question of Confirmation, much discussed during the negotiations, had been left open), and also ' to draw up a form of Communion Service embodying all the elements of the Liturgical traditions which we have inherited, for use in the first instance at the next meeting of the Synod '—that is, in January 1950, eleven months later ! The full Committee met only once, and only for one day, in September, during which some other business had to be done. The foundations had been laid at Kodaikanal, where the Convener and a few other members spent some weeks in the hot weather (April to June) ; but most of the work was done by correspondence, which was on an international scale, for experts in other countries have taken a lot of trouble over all our services. However, a draft was ready for Synod, and Synod, after a celebration conducted by Bishop Hollis, authorized it for ' optional and experimental use ' throughout the Church. The general form was issued only in July 1950 ; it was revised in 1954.[1]

The Kodaikanal group did not look for a starting-point to any of the traditional forms ; they did not try to add up or to fit in. They went to the Constitution of the Church, which lays down, in the chapter on Worship, that nine elements should be included in any Communion Service : Introductory Prayers, the Ministry of the Word, the Preparation of the Communicants (*i.e.*, the confession of sins and the declaration of God's forgiveness), the Offering of Gifts, Thanksgiving, which includes the Words of Institution and the setting apart of bread and wine, Intercession, the Lord's Prayer, the Administration, and Thanksgiving and Self-dedication. That is an outline of the Service as we now have it, except that confession comes before the reading of the Word, and intercession immediately after it. The nine parts, however, are gathered into three : the Preparation, the Ministry of the Word of God, and the Breaking of the Bread.

II

There are actually two preparatory parts. The first, which is given only in outline, includes the reading of Paul's account with its searching conclusion, the Ten Commandments or our Lord's summary of the Law and the Prophets, and an Exhortation which is drawn from the Liturgy of the United Basel Mission Church ; and there may be an interval for silent self-examination. This service may be held during the previous week

[1] *The Order for the Lord's Supper or the Holy Eucharist* (Available in Great Britain, Oxford University Press at 1s. 3d.).

(perhaps in different centres throughout the parish), or on the previous night ; or it may be held half an hour before the Communion Service begins, the worshippers waiting on quietly together. These possibilities, however, are not being tried out as they should be.

The Preparation proper may begin with a hymn of praise. The presbyter and the other ministers (who may be laymen) come in, and one of them carries ' in both hands ' the Bible from which the lessons are to be read. To read the lessons from the Prayer Book may seem to suggest that the Bible is an anthology of beautiful passages which we may employ according to taste to embellish our religious meetings. To read from the Bible itself, and to treat a copy of the book with reverence, may remind us that it is the Bible as a whole, not a selection of favourite excerpts, that brings to us the commands and the promises of the Living God. The ceremonial bringing in of the Bible, though well established in Reformed Churches, contains an echo of the Orthodox Qurbana, in which there is a ' Little Entrance ', a procession with the gospel and with lights and incense.

The presbyter may stand behind the Table, facing the people. This was probably universal for some centuries ; and in practice, rather surprisingly, it makes the presbyter and the other worshippers one people in God's presence.

For the opening prayers the people stand. Standing is the usual attitude for common prayer in the New Testament. In the Early Church the people always stood for common prayer on Sundays, in joy of the Resurrection.

The ' collect for purity ', placed at the opening by Cranmer, comes from the private prayers said by the priest before the Holy Communion, in a Prayer Book used in England before the Reformation. In our Order, the presbyter and people do everything as far as possible together. An act of praise follows, the ' Glory to God in the highest ', a Greek hymn of the fourth century, or perhaps of the third or second, based on the song of the angels at the birth of Jesus (Lk 2^{14}) and John the Baptist's testimony to Jesus (Jn 1^{29}). Our version differs in places from the version in the English Prayer Book ; for example, we follow the Methodists in saying ' sin ' for ' sins ', which is better and more Biblical. The ' Glory to God in the highest ' may instead be used, as in the Prayer Book of 1552, for the thanksgiving after Communion, and at this place any hymn of praise may be sung ; or the Trisagion or Thrice Holy may be said, another Greek hymn which is used in the Qurbana at the Little Entrance, and also in the Roman Mass on Good Friday ; or the Litany of the Lamb, sentences from the Book of Revelation, chs. 5, 12 and 6, may be read responsively after the manner of the former South India United Church. After this, if there has been no separate service of preparation, one or more of the parts appointed for that service may be used here.

Any thought of God's glory must remind us sooner or later that we fall short of it ; so Isaiah found, in his great vision. There is a call to self-examination, in silence, all kneeling ; then the Invitation to Confession from Cranmer's Prayer Book, with ' draw near ' omitted because it does not now come immediately before the Communion. The form of confession printed in the service is from *The Book of Common Order*, a little adapted. The presbyter may substitute parts of Ps 51, either of the main confessions in the Prayer Book, a hymn, or extempore prayer. The ' Comfortable Words ' of the Prayer Book, which we call ' the gracious words of God ', because the word ' comfortable ' no longer means ' strengthening ', as it did in 1549, come before the Absolution or Declaration of Forgiveness, which may be turned into a prayer for forgiveness, the presbyter praying with the people instead of for them. The form is changed so as to remind us that forgiveness is promised only to those who forgive others.

The Preparation is searching. Beginning with the praise of God's glory, it brings home to us how unworthy of it we have been and are, in our sins of omission and commission, and still more in what we are, so that we have nothing to trust in, and nothing to hope for, and nothing in the end to be glad about, apart from the mercy of God ; and it assures us also that the mercy of God more than suffices for our needs, however great they may be. I think that once our sin has been recognized and acknowledged, it should be forgotten for the rest of the service, and all our thought should be of God. We ought, speaking strictly, to omit the Prayer of Humble Access : it is out of place except immediately before the Communion, and yet it is out of place there too, because it brings us back to ourselves. But it is so beautiful, and it has such precious associations, that I am not disposed to be strict. I should mention the provision for silence, which has been called the most gracious of all forms of public worship, before the call to confession and before the declaration of God's forgiveness.

III

The second main part of the service, the Ministry of the Word of God, begins, to mark that there is a new beginning, with the Salutation, ' The Lord be with you : And with thy spirit ' (Ru 2^{4}). Then comes the collect of the day, and then three lessons, one from the Old Testament, one from the Gospels, and one from the rest of the New Testament, the

lesson from the Gospels coming last. The traditional system of 'Epistles and Gospels', as used by Romans, Anglicans, and Lutherans, virtually omits the Old Testament, which is a grave defect. God's work in Israel is not only a preparation for the coming of Christ, which may be forgotten now that He has come. Brunner (I think) has said that the Old Testament is the noun and the New Testament is the verb, and we must have both in mind continuously. The reading from the Gospels must of course never be omitted; yet we must not leave out Acts, Revelation, and the Epistles. So there must be three lessons. It is recommended that the people should stand for all three lessons, not only for the lesson from the Gospel: the Gospels are central, yet we must not behave as if what comes before and what comes after is not important. The minister is to name the book first, then the chapter, and then the verse. The people ought to bring their Bibles with them, and this makes it easier for them to find the place.

After the reading of the Bible comes the preaching of the sermon, and the people get their one chance to sit down. The sermon is obligatory, even if it is only a few words of comment on the lessons. The word 'sermon' does not exactly thrill people, though from the way they talk about services one would think they pay little attention to anything else. Ministers must do all they can to make their sermons interesting, without making them cheap: but they can do so only if they are clear about what they are doing. They must have a theology of preaching. It is useless to read the Bible together, God's Word to man in the past, unless God also speaks to man now: if all we are after is archaeological study, we could save money and time by doing it at home. If God does speak to us anywhere, it must surely be when His people come together regularly, and one of them, set apart with prayer by the rest, humbly waits on Him in order to speak in His name. We shall be wrong about the Bible, and wrong about the Church, unless we believe that preaching has a part in all public worship, and especially in its central act. This lays an obligation on the people as well as on the preacher: they must be hungry for the Word of God, eager to hear, ready to obey, stoutly believing in the Holy Spirit. If they have nothing in mind but to hear a popular address, the sermon cannot be a good sermon for them. It takes a good congregation as well as a good preacher to make a good sermon. 'Good' in this connexion, as so often, means humble.

Then we rise and say the Creed. I think that this is one of the happy touches in our Order. We hear God's Word read and spoken, and our response is to rise and say 'I believe'. Our translation is better than the Prayer Book's in that we say 'Spirit' for 'Ghost' (which except to the instructed is misleading); we say, 'the Holy Spirit, the Lord,' and then, separately, 'The Giver of Life'; we restore 'holy' before 'Church', and with commas bring out that we are saying four things about the Church: it is one, it is holy (or different), it is catholic (or world-wide), it is apostolic (or missionary).

This is the place for announcements and biddings. Then, reassured that God forgives sinners and that He speaks to us to-day, we go on to express our faith that He also hears and acts to-day, in a prayer of intercession. Two forms are provided, both litanies: here, as throughout the service, the people are not listeners or spectators, but actors. The first litany is an adaptation, coming to us through Colombo, of the Prayer for the Church in the Prayer Book. The second is based on the Liturgy of St. James, the liturgy principally used in the Syrian Churches, but it comes to us through the Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. It was used at the Inauguration, but has been a good deal revised since then. Other forms or extempore prayer may be used. The alternative collects are taken from the Prayer Book, the first (1549) coming after the Communion Service, the second, an old Roman prayer (Gelasian), being provided for Good Friday.

There is then a benediction, and those who are not going to communicate may leave the church.

IV

The third part begins with sentences on unity, all standing, and the Peace may be exchanged, as in the Orthodox Churches, by a hand-clasp. A hymn is sung. Hymns may also be sung at the beginning, after the Old Testament, and after the Creed, but now at the Offertory a hymn is almost necessary. And the collection may be taken now (or during the hymn after the Creed), though it is better that the people's offerings, if in money, should be given as they enter the church. At any rate, the offerings are brought to the Table during this hymn, and are received by the presbyter. The bread and wine for the Communion are brought to the Table along with the money, by laymen and women: this is one of the points at which it can be clearly shown that the people have their own part in the service. This is the Great Entrance. The money and the elements together make up the people's offertory, their sacrifice, and should be kept on the Table together. This is all done during the hymn. When the hymn is over, the bearers of the offertory still stand before the Table, with all the congregation standing too, for the 'prayer of the veil' (He 10^{20}, though the word 'veil' is omitted), a prayer that since a way to the

holy place has been opened for all by Christ through His death, God may accept and use us and these our gifts for His glory. The bearers of the offertory return to their places, and all kneel, and say together a prayer which for me is always one of the great moments of the service, the prayer for the presence of Jesus. It is made up of a sentence from an early Spanish mass, the Mozarabic, and another from the second-century Church handbook, *The Teaching of the Twelve*.

There is a second Salutation, then the old cry 'Lift up your hearts', the Preface, common or proper, the Thrice Holy, and the 'Blessed be He': all of them very old prayers, the last being used in the Eastern version, 'Blessed be He that hath come and is to come'. So we reach the Eucharistic Prayer or Great Thanksgiving, which includes the Words of Institution, taken partly from Mark and partly from First Corinthians. As the presbyter says them he 'takes' the cup and paten into his hand, but he does not at this point break the bread, for that belongs to the Communion. Immediately after the Words of Institution comes what I find to be the second great moment: a response by all the people, taken with some adaptation from the Qurbana: 'Amen. Thy death, O Lord, we commemorate, Thy resurrection we confess, Thy second coming we await. Glory be to Thee, O Christ.'

The second paragraph is more clearly remembrance or memorial (anamnesis), and has another response of thanksgiving; while the third paragraph is Epiclesis, a calling on the Holy Spirit to sanctify us and these gifts of God, the bread and wine, with a prayer for unity in Him and in the faith. The presbyter kneels, and all together say the Lord's Prayer 'boldly', having remembered what God has done. The Prayer of Humble Access follows, a little changed so as not to suggest that we ought to work out how it is that the bread of the Communion is good for our bodies, while the wine is good for our souls. The presbyter rises, and breaks the bread, quoting Paul, 'The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' (1 Co 10^{16}), or another sentence from the Orthodox liturgy, *ta hagia tois hagiois*, which some one has beautifully translated 'The things of God for the people of God'. Holy does not mean extra good, it means set apart or called by God, as we are. The presbyter himself communicates, and then distributes according to the custom of the place. During the distribution the old Latin hymn, 'O Lamb of God,' part of which appears in the 'Glory to God in the highest', may be said or sung.

The sacrament ends simply: a collect combining thanks to God with the offering of ourselves, either a form based on Scripture (Eph 1^{6}, Jn 6^{53-56}, Ro $12^{1ff.}$), or one which runs together two in the Prayer Book; an ascription (Rev 7^{12}) in which all join; and the 'Peace Benediction' from the Prayer Book; with a final hymn of praise while the ministers go out.

V

It is a complete service: all the essential parts are there, clearly marked off and yet passing naturally into one another. The meaning is spread out through the whole: there is no one 'moment of consecration', whether it is the repeating of the Words of Institution or the prayer to the Holy Spirit. It involves every one, the laymen present cannot regard themselves as passengers or as the beneficiaries of an act put on for them by the professionals. It is all that we all do that works, and every part has its own meaning in its own proper place. It gives due weight both to the Holy Spirit and to Jesus' teaching about the End. It is catholic and traditional, corporate, gathering and conveying the stored-up wisdom of all the Christian generations, and yet making it plain that the decisive thing is the action of God now; it reaches the heart, and it rests squarely on the Word of God.

Entre Nous

Gathering up the Fragments

It is but natural that men should be interested in the slightest *obiter dicta* of a truly great man; it is but natural that they should wish to gather up even the stray and half-forgotten pearls of wisdom which fell from his lips. And, if that is true of a great man, how much truer must it be of Jesus. It is quite clear, as John said long ago (Jn 21^{25}), that the Gospels cannot possibly contain all that Jesus said and did, and it is, therefore, natural that men should eagerly seek for sayings and for deeds of Jesus beyond the gospel story. Such sayings and such stories do exist, and Roderic Dunkerley has comprehensively and fascinatingly collected them in a little book entitled *Beyond the Gospels* (Penguin Books; 3s. 6d.).

Certain of these stories and sayings come from

Gospels which enjoyed a local and temporary authority but which in the end failed to gain entrance to the New Testament. One of the most famous of these gospels is the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, and in it there is the famous and helpful expansion of the story of the Rich Young Ruler :

> ' The other of the rich men said to Jesus, Master, what good thing shall I do to live ? He said to him, Man, do the law and the prophets. He answered him, I have. He said to him, Go, sell all that thou hast, and distribute to the poor, and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it pleased him not. And the Lord said unto him, How sayest thou, I have done the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, and behold many brethren of thine, sons of Abraham, are clad in filth, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of good things, and nothing at all goes out from it to them ? And He turned and said to Simon His disciple, who was sitting by Him, Simon, son of John, it is easier for a camel to enter through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.'

This story, with its vivid detail, has all the marks of genuineness ; and it makes clear the point that it is not riches but the selfish use of riches which is condemned.

Certain of these sayings are what are called *agrapha*, unwritten sayings. They must have been floating sayings which passed from lip to lip, but which were somehow never written down. There are at least some few of them which are well worth rescuing. The commonest of them all—it is quoted in early Christian literature almost twenty times—is : ' In whatsoever things I apprehend you, in these I shall judge you.' Others of these floating sayings are : ' Show yourselves wise bankers.' ' He who is near me is near the fire ; he who is far from me is far from the kingdom.' ' That which is weak shall be saved by that which is strong.' Perhaps the most interesting of these sayings is the following : ' Except ye make the right hand as the left, and the left hand as the right, and that which is upwards as that which is downwards, and that which is before as that which is behind, ye shall not know the kingdom of God.' When does the right hand become as the left, and that which is before as that which is behind ? Obviously, *when a man turns round.* When a man turns round, he reverses his directions. The word *conversion* literally means *a turning round*, and, therefore, this saying is a vivid and pictorial way of describing what conversion means.

Certain of these sayings come from papyrus fragments dug up in the sands of Egypt. Two of the most famous of these are the following. ' Wherever there are two, they are not without God, and wherever there is one alone, I say that I am with him. Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me ; cleave the wood, and there I am.' As the mason works at his stone, and as the carpenter works at his wood Christ is there. ' Let not him who seeks cease until he finds ; and when he finds he shall be astonished ; astonished, he shall reign ; and having reigned, he shall rest.' Wonder is the key emotion of the Christian life.

Some few of these sayings actually come from Moslem sources, for to the Moslems Jesus is a great prophet. Two of the most famous of these are the following : ' Whoso craves wealth is as a man who drinks sea-water ; the more he drinks, the more he increases his thirst, and he ceases not to drink until he perishes.' From the gateway of the mosque at Fateh-pur-sikri near Agra, built by Akbar, the great Mogul Emperor, there comes the lovely saying : ' The world is only a bridge ; ye are to pass over it and not to build your dwellings on it.'

We are indebted to Dr. Dunkerley for gathering up the fragments, and we are delighted to have this scholarly and charming book at so cheap a price.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Illiterates and the Gospel

Just before I left for South India last July the Editor sent me a pamphlet entitled *The Communication of the Gospel to the Illiterates* (S.C.M. ; 7s. 6d. net). It is No. 4 in a series sponsored by the International Missionary Council ; it is written by the Rev. H. R. Weber, a Swiss and a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church ; and it is based on his experiences in Indonesia. I have waited to write this note till I returned from India. Everywhere I went in city and town and village in South India, I asked questions about this problem of missionary work and illiteracy, and I showed this pamphlet to many experienced workers. They all agreed that it is good, very good indeed ; it should be read and carefully studied by all who are engaged, or hope to be engaged, in village work.

My judgment, based on a limited personal experience but on much ' borrowed ' experience, is that everything depends on the village. I received very many different answers as to what is the best way of introducing the gospel to illiterates. I have sorted it out this way : there are two factors to consider. The first is the intelligence of the individual. This varies as much in a backward community as in a sophisticated city : some of the illiterates never will understand anything to any noticeable extent : others are astonishingly quick in their reaction. It is therefore a mistake to lump

all illiterates together, as many do. Think of the number of people in England even to-day who cannot read ; and many of these are not exactly sub-normal, they are just dull and cannot be made interested. The other fact is ' How " jungley " are they ? ' Some teachers say that no picture of any kind is any good because the villager cannot understand what a picture is when it is on a flat surface. He needs to be able to walk around it. Or again, he cannot understand that a figure one inch high on a flat picture is really a man of five-feet-six. Others say, ' It is all right if you are patient and keep at it. They all understand in time '. Yet others say ' Of course they know all about photographs. You should see them crowding into the buses to go into the town to go to the cinema. Those buses are all elastic-sided '. Or again, ' Have you never heard of the travelling cinemas ? Most of the villages round here see a travelling cinema about once a week '. So it all depends on the village, and now that, in the State of Mysore, for instance, electricity is being brought into the villages, the tempo of advance of amenities will increase rapidly.

I did see for myself the use of flannelgraphs in two villages in the south of Mysore, Kastur and Bhogapura. The churches in each case were full—all sitting on the floor, women on one side, men on the other, with all the youngsters in front. The interest was intense. It was just before Christmas, and the story was of the wise men, the shepherds and Bethlehem. Further, the open door was full of *layers* of faces, and so was every window up to a height that had to be seen to be believed. The advantage of flannelgraphs is that in practice they are semi-three-dimensional. This is a very great help in the villages.

I came across another method of preaching the gospel. This was at Alwar Tirunagari, a sizeable town in the far south about thirty miles from Tirunelveli, and not very far from Cape Comorin (the southern tip of India). A team of theological students from the near-by Tamilnad (' nad ' means ' country ') College at Tirumaraiyur were conducting a week-end evangelistic campaign. It was a story told primarily for the children but with adults listening in. It was a ' repetition ' story, but done in a particular way. The story was about a boy named, say, George who went for a walk in the tiger-jungle. ' Who went for a walk ? ' Chorus of ' George '. ' Where did he walk ? ' Chorus of ' in the tiger-jungle '. ' And he met a tiger : who met a tiger ? ' Another chorus of ' George ' and so it went on. I forget what the moral of the story was, but I do remember it was not a very good one. I tried an English story with a Kannada (Mysore language) interpreter later at Tumkur (forty miles from Bangalore), and adopted the same kind of continual question, with the result after the first few times that the brighter youngsters came in with the Kannada word whilst I was still busy with the English. I am inclined to think that this way of telling a story has its value for children in this country as well as for illiterates in India.

This pamphlet deserves, and I hope it will get, careful study.

NORMAN H. SNAITH

International Old Testament Congress

The Third International Congress for the Study of the Old Testament will be held at Oxford from Monday, 31st August to Saturday, 5th September, 1959. Circulars giving details of the arrangements will be issued from time to time. All inquiries and other correspondence should be addressed to—Miss E. A. Livingstone, Secretary to the Congress for the Study of the Old Testament, Priory House, Christ Church, Oxford.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.